Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-145
Friday
27 July 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-145 *27 July 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Chemical Arms Pullout From FRG Hailed *[TASS]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Commission Opens Talks in Prague *[TASS]* 2
CEMA Could Follow EFTA or OECD Pattern *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Europarliament Decision on GDR Representation *[PRAVDA 23 Jul]* 4
NATO Cancels Maneuvers at Turkey's Request *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 4
Conference on Arms Conversion Previewed *[TASS]* 4
PRC, SRV Praised for Desire To Improve Ties *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Proposal To Reduce Naval Arms 'Very Timely' *[TASS]* 6
History of 'Demobilization' Studied *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 6
Bush Opposes 'Inordinate' Cuts *[TASS]* 8
Congress, Pentagon Debate Issue *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 9
U.S. Outdated 'Cold War Rhetoric' Viewed *[TASS]* 9
Shevardnadze Awarded U.S. Anti-War Prize *[TASS]* 10
U.S. Space Group Assesses Soviet Rocket Use *[Moscow International]* 10
Estonian Russians, Senator Discuss Representation *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 7 Jun]* 10
Lithuanian Vice Premier Arrives in Washington *[Vilnius Radio]* 11
'Dartmouth' Meeting in Leningrad Ends 25 Jul *[TASS]* 11

China

CPSU, China's Communist Party Discuss Ties *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 12
PRC Group Visits Newly Opened Maritime Area *[Moscow International]* 12

Northeast Asia

Further on Visit by Japanese Group 12
Lukyanov Discusses Relations *[TASS]* 12
Gorbachev, Group Head Discuss Islands *[Moscow International]* 13
Strong Ties Advocated *[Tokyo KYODO]* 13
Ruling Party in Japan Wants Tax Reform Debate *[Tokyo KYODO]* 13
Japan, RSFSR Trade Cooperation Memo Signed *[Moscow Radio]* 14
DPRK Delegation's Visit to Seoul Reported *[Moscow International]* 14
More on DPRK Poaching Case, Plan for Appeal *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 14
Troop Withdrawal From Mongolia Ahead of Schedule *[TASS]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further on U.S. Change in Policy on Cambodia 15
'Derecognition' of Khmer Rouge Hailed *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 15
Reactions Vary *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 15

Near East & South Asia

More on Visit by Indian Prime Minister 16
Gorbachev, Singh Sign Economic Accord *[Delhi Radio]* 16
Singh Assesses Visit *[TASS]* 16
Indian Premier Returns Home *[TASS]* 17
Ryzhkov Lauds Monument to Indian Poet *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]* 17
OPEC Ministers Meet, Discuss Iraq-Kuwait Crisis *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 17
Iranian Leader Thanks Azerbaijan for Aid *[Baku Radio]* 18
Tensions in Lebanon Assume 'Massive Proportions' *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 18
Chamber of Commerce Mission Opens in Tel Aviv *[TASS]* 19
Delegation Arrives in Syria for Talks *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jul]* 19
Soviet, Syrian Foreign Ministers Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Frolov Receives Omani Goodwill Delegation *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 19
Moroccan Envoy Corrects Press 'Inaccuracies' *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 19

Sub-Saharan Africa

Mandela's 6-Week World-Wide Tour Viewed *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 20
UN Relief Aid to Ethiopia Blocked, Famine Risked *[Moscow International]* 20
Soviet Trawler Seized by Somali Group *[TASS]* 21

East Europe

Statement on Ties by Albanian Official Examined *[Moscow International]* 21
Disagreements, Disorder Prevalent in Bulgaria *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Lithuanian Leader Seeks Open Border With Poland *[Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY 24 Jul]* 22
Silayev Receives Serbian Official From Yugoslavia *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]* 23

West Europe

Italian Prime Minister Andreotti Concludes Visit 23
Talks Considered 'Fruitful' *[TASS]* 23
European Issues Discussed *[PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 24
News Conference Held 26 Jul *[Moscow TV]* 25
Andreotti Leaves Moscow *[TASS]* 28
New Soviet-Italian Magazine To Be Published *[TASS]* 28
Italy's Central Committee Ends Two-Day Plenum *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 28
Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Swedish Premier *[TASS]* 29
Soviet Ambassador Takes Up Post in Sweden *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 25 Jul]* 29
Swedish Cabinet To Rule on Hijacking Extradition *[TASS]* 29
Greek Frigate Concludes Visit to Sevastopol *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jul]* 29
Consultations on Near East Staged in Ireland *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Bank of England: No Record of Ukraine Gold *[TASS]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Involvement in Cubans' Asylum Bid Reported 30
Actions 'Planned' by U.S. *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 30
U.S. Section Denies Charges *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 30
Cooperation Prospects With Cuba Examined *[Moscow International]* 32
Cuban Ambassador Delivers National Day Address *[Moscow TV]* 32
Cuban Army Political Workers' Visit Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jul]* 32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

28th CPSU Congress

CPSU Thanks Foreign Well-Wishers to Congress *[PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 33
Ulyanov Speech on 'Renewed Socialism' Published *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 28]* 33

Political and Social

Law Officers Discuss Decree Banning Armed Groups *[TASS]* 35
Moiseyev, MVD Aide on Decree *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 36
Kravtsov Discusses Illegal Possession of Weapons *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Kalugin Denies Revealing 'State Secrets' to Media *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Jul]* 38
KGB Official Reviews Measures Against Hijacking *[Moscow Radio]* 38
Yakovlev Criticizes 'Conservatives' at Congress *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 39
Poll Registers Decline in Support for CPSU *[TASS]* 40
Ivashko on Cooperation With Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 41
Columnist Urges 'Defense of Perestroyka' *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 41
Abalkin Views Transition to Market Economy
[Frankfurt/FMain FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 26 Jul] 42
More on Revenko's Union Treaty Press Briefing *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jul]* 43
CPSU Delegates Discuss Party Press Issues *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 43

Economic

State Budget Deficit Down to 24 Billion Rubles *[TASS]* 49
Katushev Assesses Convertible Currency Trade *[Moscow TV]* 50
Abalkin Defends Government's Reform Course *[VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA 14 Jul]* 50
Abalkin Delivers Report on Economic Strategy *[TASS]* 51
Methods for Change to Market Economy Cited *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jul]* 52
Attempts To Circulate Hard Currency Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Jul]* 53
Talks Between Republics on Bank Reform Urged *[PRAVDA 23 Jul]* 53
Foreign Group Praises Nuclear Waste Plant *[TASS]* 54
Multistory Housing Still Built Despite Drawbacks *[Moscow TV]* 54
Converted Defense Plant Boosts Civilian Output *[Moscow International]* 55

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 18-25 July *[Moscow Radio]* 55
'Vremya' Reports on Harvesting Progress *[Moscow TV]* 56
Grain Harvest Has 'More Than Enough Problems' *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]* 56
Mid-July Weather, Crop Conditions Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 25 Jul]* 57
Gossnab Confers on Harvest Preparations *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Transport Problems Bedevil Kuybyshev Harvest *[Moscow TV]* 58

Scientific

Reportage on Efforts To Repair Hatch on 'Mir' 60
Problems With Space Walk *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Cosmonauts 'Behind Schedule' *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Cosmonauts' Space Walk Extended *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Hatch Problem Determined *[Moscow TV]* 60
Cosmonauts Close Hatch *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Mir Station Hatch Repaired *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Activities Aboard Mir Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 61
Future Work in Space Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 62
'Cosmos-2087' Satellite Launched 25 Jul *[TASS]* 62

Military

Akhromeyev, Arbatov Interviewed on Military Threat *[Moscow TV]* 63
Continuing Need for CPSU Organs in Army Argued *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 65
Admiral Panin Interviewed on Naval Reforms *[TASS]* 66
Missile Installation Destruction Causes No Damage *[Moscow TV]* 66

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Criticizes Absence of Baltic Heads *[Vilnius Radio]* 67
Yeltsin Holds Talks With Latvian Officials 67
Discuss Cooperation Treaty *[Riga Radio]* 67
'Resting' in Latvia *[Vilnius Radio]* 67
Latvian 27 Jul Supreme Council Session Relayed 67
Penal Code, TU Property Discussed *[Vilnius Radio]* 67
Relay 'Requested by Deputies' *[Riga Radio]* 68
Lithuanian 26 Jul Supreme Council Session Relayed *[Vilnius Radio]* 68
Lithuanian, Soviet Foreign Ministry Delegates Meet *[Vilnius Radio]* 69
Prunskiene Addresses Seminar in Finland *[EKHO LITVY 3 Jul]* 69
Vilnius District Guarantees Minorities' Rights *[TASS]* 69
Estonia Sends Note to USSR Government *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]* 70
Estonian Anti-Army Sentiment Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Jul]* 70

RSFSR

First Deputy Chairman Khasbulatov Interviewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 18 Jul]* 73
Russian Democratic Party Head on Reform *[Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY 24 Jul]* 74
Polozkov Views on Congress, Conference *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 76
Ulyanovsk Raykom Urges Dismissal of Militia Head *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 76
Vladimir Party Leader Reassigned; Deputy Acting *[PRAVDA 25 Jul]* 77
Rostov Nuclear Power Station To Be 'Mothballed' *[Moscow TV]* 77
Murmansk Food Supply Problems Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 77
Stavropol Grain Harvest Going Well *[Moscow TV]* 78
Perm Agro-Industry Blockade Threat Discussed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jul]* 78
Vegetable Supplies Improve in Perm Oblast *[Moscow TV]* 79

Western Republics

Belorussia Adopts Sovereignty Declaration 27 Jul *[Minsk Radio]* 80
Belorussian 27 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Aired *[Minsk Radio]* 80
Belorussian 26 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Aired 81
New Constitution Discussed *[Minsk Radio]* 81
Culture, Security Issues Viewed *[Minsk Radio]* 81
IAEA Offers Belorussia Chernobyl Cleanup Help *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 81
Ukrainian Deputies on Resignation From CPSU *[Moscow TV]* 82
'Democratic Platform' To Establish Ukraine Party *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]* 83
Ukraine Government, Miners Strike Committee Meets 83
Miners Ask Gurenko To Leave *[Moscow International]* 83
'Modernization' Seen as Problem *[Kiev International]* 83
New Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 84
Girenko Visits Ukraine's Kherson Oblast *[Moscow Radio]* 84
Chernobyl Engineer Says No. 4 Block Still Threat
[Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 26 Jul] 84
Doguzhiyev on Resettlement of Crimean Tatars *[Moscow TV]* 85
Lvov Obkom, Deputies Vie for Premises *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul]* 85
Army Brutality Rumor Fails in Lvov *[PRAVDA 24 Jul]* 85
Kiev Streetcar, Trolleybus Drivers Strike *[Moscow TV]* 86
Ukrainian Decree on Time Zone Change *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 17 Jun]* 86

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution *[TASS]* 86
Moldovan Supreme Soviet Approves New Laws *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Gagauz Representatives Hold Extraordinary Congress *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jul]* 87

Caucasus

Soviet Kurds Demand Autonomous Region *[AFP]* 87
Azerbaijan Party Congress Resumes 27 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Popular Front Branch Activity in Sabirabad Halted *[Baku Radio]* 88
Militia Workers Dismissed From Posts in NKAO *[Yerevan International]* 88
Armenian Militants Refuse To Hand Over Arms *[AFP]* 88
Armenian Supreme Soviet Commission on Decree *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Armenia Restores Ayrikyan's Citizenship *[Yerevan Radio]* 89
Georgians Protest for Multiparty System *[TASS]* 89
Gumbaridze Views Sovereignty, Draft Laws *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 24 Jun]* 89
Gumbaridze Receives Regional Party Chiefs *[Moscow Radio]* 98
Caucasus Shootings, Arms Seizures, Explosion Seen *[Moscow Radio]* 98

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Interviewed on Kazakh Affairs *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 98
Situation in Osh Reportedly Normalizing *[TASS]* 99
Continuing Army Role in Kirghizia Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]* 100
'Special Order' Lifts Curfew in Dushanbe *[TASS]* 101
Uzbek Decree on Oversight Law Published *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 30 Jun]* 102
Uzbek Constitutional Oversight Law Passed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 30 Jun]* 102

U.S. Chemical Arms Pullout From FRG Hailed

LD2607133190 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—"The withdrawal of U.S. chemical weapons from West German territory, announced earlier by the West German Defence Ministry, began today," Stanislav Petrov, colonel general, head of Soviet chemical forces, told TASS.

He noted that he considers this event "positive and constructive."

According to Petrov, U.S. specialists have to withdraw and destroy 102,000 artillery shells outside the West German territory by October 1. The shells contain nerve gas.

"This advance towards cutting and then banning chemical weapons has become possible thanks to the strengthening of security and arms cuts," Petrov said.

The USSR and the United States have achieved and are implementing bilateral understandings on chemical weapons, which provide for confidence-building measures," the general stressed.

"Along with positive changes in the world, we sometimes witness relapses of the cold war," Petrov noted. Some Western circles are spreading rumours about a "Soviet chemical threat."

A report was recently circulated in West Germany that 30,000 tonnes of chemical weapons are kept at nine depots of the Western Army Group stationed in the German Democratic Republic.

The report also said that the Soviet Union allegedly has 32 chemical arms depots outside its territory.

"This is pure fabrication. The USSR has no chemical weapons outside its territory," Petrov concluded.

Warsaw Pact Commission Opens Talks in Prague

LD1607130190 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 16 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoly Shapovalov]

[Text] Prague July 16 TASS—An interim governmental commission of Warsaw Treaty member-states opened three days of talks in Celakovice near Prague on Sunday.

The commission, set up following a declaration signed in Moscow during the recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, will discuss reforms in the pact, Czechoslovak Deputy Foreign Minister Lubos Dubrovsky told the CTK News Agency.

The meeting will prepare a draft reflecting the positions of individual member-states, he said.

The Warsaw Treaty should agree on limiting its military structures, he said.

National armies of individual member-states will be taken from under the control of the allied command and will be put under the control of national high commands, he said.

"We will seek practical solutions that could help radically transform the Warsaw Treaty," he said.

The transformation will speed up the emergence of new security structures in Europe and promote stability on the continent, he said.

CEMA Could Follow EFTA or OECD Pattern

PM2607113590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences I. Frantseva: "Difficult Return to Europe"]

[Text] The stunning events in East Europe and perestroyka in the USSR coincided with the new round of integration in the EC. Objectively a unique historical opportunity has occurred for forming a new, democratic, pan-European order. And since the new is often something old and long forgotten, events in East Europe are happening under the slogan of the "return to Europe."

However, you cannot call what is happening now a detente, as in the past, because the intensity of the search for mutually acceptable solutions increases as the new ideas and slogans, completing their triumphal procession around the world, give way to practical deeds. The problems of drawing the East European countries and the USSR into the system of European division of labor demand a reconsideration of our conventional ideas about Europe.

One of the most difficult problems is the question of the future of CEMA. Created in 1949, it was designed to serve Stalin's imperial policy. Economic integration within the CEMA framework was essentially an interstate regulation of commodity supplies. It was the ideologized character of economic ties between the partners, their autarkic orientation, disregard of commodity-money relations, and remoteness from the objective criteria of world economic development that led to a deformation of the structure of those relations, a divergence of economic interests, and debt problems. CEMA became the prisoner of an outmoded political system. In the East European countries its subordination to diktat was made more "palatable" by supplies of cheap fuel and raw materials from the USSR. For its part the USSR paid for its geopolitical stability with its natural resources, enshrining in the structure of its foreign economic ties the hallmarks of a developing country.

Both Soviet and foreign economists are unanimous today in the view that, without the transition to market relations, our country has no future as a highly developed world power. To this it may be added that the future is also problematical unless we abandon political decisions in the sphere of foreign economic ties. The problems of mutual relations among the CEMA members is to a considerable extent the logical outcome of historical errors and therefore trade and economic ties, cleansed of ideology, must enter their natural course. Meanwhile, a certain reorientation of the East European countries' commodity exchange toward the traditional West European partners is inevitable, in exchange for which the ties that remain will truly be mutually beneficial and more rational. As they pass through various stages of the transitional period from totalitarianism to democracy and from centralism to the market, such ties will create "interlocking" economic mechanisms, which will facilitate their collaboration and will help to flexibly combine bilateral forms of cooperation with all-European forms.

The reform of intra-CEMA relations is complicated by the diversity and instability of political situations and the state of crisis of virtually all the partners' economies. The decision to switch to payments in freely convertible currency on the basis of world prices adopted at the 45th CEMA session will, by all accounts, provide only temporary relief. The unbalanced nature of commodity exchange and the inconvertibility of the balance sheet may lead them into an impasse.

It seems that, when reviewing the principles of mutual relations in the CEMA framework, it is necessary to repudiate the old stereotypes and look at CEMA in an all-European context from the viewpoint of the worldwide and West European experience of cooperation. The logic of that may lead CEMA to choose a completely different guideline: not integration of the EEC type but the creation of a free trade zone of the EFTA [European Free Trade Association] type or an organization for consultations, information exchange, and coordination of the OECD type or perhaps structures incorporating both the former and latter features. One thing is obvious: political decisions cannot replace the objective interchangeability of economic structures which exists not

only between East and West Europe but also between East Europe and the Soviet Union. All forms of relations are good if they fit into the logic of forming a European economic space.

One way or another, all the European countries have now become involved in the process of forming the European economic space. But the center of attraction and the generator of incentives is, undoubtedly, the EEC. The EEC member countries remain our closest neighbors in the West and most important trading partners, and our relations with them have entered a new stage. They have an interest in the stability of the political situation on the continent and the development of economic cooperation with East Europe and the Soviet Union. That is why the community has elaborated in a very short period a new "eastern" policy concept which meets the spirit of the times and offers new prospects in Europe. It is planned to conclude a second generation of bilateral agreements between the community and the central and East European countries—agreements of association—in the very near future. These agreements will mark the transfer of relations to a new level where the development of trade and economic ties will be combined with political dialogue and close cooperation in the cultural sphere. Even now the concept is being reinforced by a concrete action program aimed at supporting the process of democratization in the central and East European countries and "alleviating" the difficulties of the transition to a market economy.

While welcoming the changes in East Europe and the USSR, the community takes a quite sober view of the forthcoming transition period, which will undoubtedly be both lengthy and complex. The decisive role in this period will be played by the economy and economic relations between countries. Characterizing the significance of the 40-year experience of socioeconomic development within the community framework, EC Commission Chairman J. Delors stressed the inadequacy of political treaties and institutions for preserving peace. "In conditions of the growing interdependence of states," he said, "peace will increasingly depend on the harmonious conditions of nations' economic and social development. It is this path of economic interdependence and openness which the countries of central and Eastern Europe have now chosen, and the Soviet Union will probably commit itself to the same direction."

Today it is becoming increasingly obvious that democratic traditions and the elements of market relations that have been retained will enable the East European countries to enter more rapidly into closer economic ties with Western Europe. The Soviet Union will have to resolve more complex and larger-scale tasks, create a market environment from scratch, and "educate" people about market relations. The pace and method whereby these tasks are resolved will largely also determine the future of CEMA and the common European home.

Initially the USSR possesses everything necessary to fashion its own integrated "common" market, everything... except market relations and a new union treaty. Now that the course has been set toward forming the bases of a market economy, it is important to see not only the dangers but also the advantages of switching to the market and the mutual benefit of establishing market ties between enterprises in different republics.

The competitiveness of the the economy of the Union and of each republic individually in the European and world market and the people's well-being depend directly on the elimination of centrifugal tendencies. The desire to remain aloof runs counter to world trends and the integration processes in the EC, where regional ties are beginning to play an increasing role. Republican "autarky" threatens to make our half-hearted economic reform even more protracted, which will consequently put us in the position of an "outsider," consign us to the extreme edge of the European economic space and, at worst, could mean profound isolation and economic backwardness. Meanwhile, the country's unique natural potential together with conditions of free enterprise, competition, and everyone's interest in the results of his labor could make it in time the new engine of economic cooperation in Europe.

Europarliament Decision on GDR Representation

PM2607083190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by correspondent V. Peresada: "No Luck With 'Being Patient'"]

[Text] Brussels, 22 Jul—The question of German unification, which has been the subject of discussions, talks, and conferences literally all over Europe, did not bypass an institution like the European parliament without provoking sharp debate. The way that united Germany will be represented there was the topic of fierce arguments in the European parliament headquarters in Brussels and particularly in Strasburg.

And indeed, how will it be represented? After 2 December, the whole of Germany should join the EC. There is no particular problem with its membership of the "Common Market": This is an intergovernmental organization. Whereas the European parliament is formed by means of direct elections in all community countries, and the 16 million strong GDR population has, of course, not participated in them before. The next elections will not be held until 1994.

The most diverse options have been put forward. The proposal to "be patient" until 1994 was rejected immediately because, as the adopted resolution says, a situation whereby either 16 million Europeans are not represented or this function is performed by Eurodeputies from the present FRG cannot be allowed to develop. To hold interim elections only in Germany, without changing the existing ballot system, would mean putting this country in a disadvantageous situation compared with the others (after unification, one German Eurodeputy would represent 1 million inhabitants, while a Luxembourg Eurodeputy, for instance, would represent only 60,000). Ultimately, it was decided that the representation of East Germany's population until 1994 would be performed by specially invited observers.

NATO Cancels Maneuvers at Turkey's Request

PM2607135990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Maneuvers Canceled"]

[Text] Brussels, 25 Jul—At the request of the Turkish Government the NATO Command has canceled the military maneuvers code-named "Ader [name as transliterated] Exchange," which were to have taken place on that country's territory in September.

A spokesman for the Main Staff of the NATO Supreme Allied Command Europe reported that the Turkish Government based this request on the change in the international situation.

At the same time he pointed out that, contrary to rumors which have been spread recently, preparations are continuing for one of the bloc's largest exercises—"Bold Guard-90"—which are held regularly once every four years.

Conference on Arms Conversion Previewed

LD2707082390 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 27 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] New York July 27 TASS—The conversion of the military industry has evoked growing interest lately, UN Undersecretary General for Disarmament Yasushi Akashi told a news conference at UN headquarters on Thursday.

The news conference was devoted to the United Nations conference in Moscow (from August 13-17), devoted to conversion's economic regulators in the era of arms reduction.

The conference, which will be attended by representatives of 40 countries, will consider problems of conversion and how different nations have addressed them.

A few days ago, Akashi said, the governor of an American state, where conversion resulted in unemployment, spoke about the need to take as close a look at the seamy side of peace dividends as at their bright side.

The UN undersecretary general said he was confident that dividends from the brighter side of conversion would prevail in the long term, but this victory requires minimizing the complexities of the transition from military to peace-oriented production.

In the long term, economies will undoubtedly profit from conversion, but efforts are needed during the transition period to retool military facilities and retrain labour. Of course, it is an additional headache for enterprises, but it has to be borne, Akashi said.

In his address to the United Nations, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev stressed the importance of conversion and the Soviet Union's determination to begin it on a broad scale, the UN undersecretary general said.

It has been suggested that the United Nations should establish a conversion information centre. The conference in Moscow will be the first UN forum devoted to the issue. Akashi said he expected an open exchange of views and experience on this important issue.

PRC, SRV Praised for Desire To Improve Ties

OW2607140890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] During his meeting with a delegation from Australia's China committee, Chinese Premier Li Peng

expressed his hope that Sino-Vietnamese relations will be improved on the basis of an overall and impartial settlement of the Cambodia issue. A commentary in this regard by Mikhaylov, an observer of this station, follows:

The Cambodia issue is the major obstacle to complete normalization of Vietnamese-Chinese relations. Beijing has repeatedly stated that it does not consider its relations with Hanoi to be normal before an overall settlement of the Cambodia issue. Since Vietnam's First Vice Foreign Minister Dinh Nho Liem's visit to China early last year, the vice foreign ministers of the two countries have held four meetings. The Cambodia issue was the focus of attention during those meetings. The two sides have reached a certain degree of mutual understanding over the complex issue. For instance, they have agreed on the necessity to establish a international supervisory organ; respect Cambodia's independence, sovereignty, and neutrality; and recognize Cambodia's nonaligned status.

However, there still exist quite serious differences, particularly those concerning external mediation of the Cambodia issue. For this reason, the Chinese side has described Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Xu Dunxin's visit to Hanoi in the middle of June as fruitless. The Sino-Vietnamese dialogue on the Cambodia issue is no doubt beyond the limits of their bilateral relations. Hence, both the people in this region and those outside the region are paying close attention to their dialogue. Many people believe that a consensus between Beijing and Hanoi will help, to a great extent, bring the 11-year war in Cambodia to an end.

Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gremitskikh said recently: The lack of progress in the Sino-Vietnamese meetings had created some difficulties for the recent round of talks on the Cambodia issue held by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. It was true indeed. If there is no consensus between China and Vietnam, peace cannot be expected between them. This fact has been known to all those involved in the settlement of the Cambodia issue. It has also been confirmed by the recent U.S. decision to hold direct dialogue with Hanoi. I believe that both China and Vietnam desire to improve their relations and seek a way together to settle the Cambodia issue. Such a desire is welcome. The two countries shoulder not only the responsibility for improving their bilateral relations, but also the heavy responsibility for promoting peace, security, and cooperation in the region.

United States & Canada

U.S. Proposal To Reduce Naval Arms 'Very Timely'

LD2407201790 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 24 Jul 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshov]

[Text] Moscow July 24 TASS—The Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Congress adopted a special provision to the draft military budget for fiscal 1991. It contains recommendations to the Pentagon and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to compile a report for Congress on limiting armaments at seas, including nuclear armaments.

The Senate committee's decision, which increases pressure on the Defence Department and the command of the U.S. Navy to secure from them a real shift in the approach to the problem of naval armaments, seems to be very timely.

It's time for the Pentagon to renounce the outdated and dogmatic stance that does not accept any proposals for curbing and reducing naval weapons.

Now that the signing of a Soviet-U.S. treaty to reduce strategic offensive armaments and a treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact to lower significantly conventional military potentials in Europe has become real, the issue of naval fleets is assuming an increasingly greater importance.

Armed forces are a uniform mechanism, in which land forces, air force and naval forces interact, supplement and reinforce each other. Only a comprehensive appraisal makes it possible to draw a general picture of the coorelation of military potentials of countries and blocs.

Agreements at the Vienna talks and their implementation will ensure a balance of forces in Europe at a lower level of conventional armaments of land forces and the air force. Would it be fair in this case to leave aside the parties' naval forces?

It is common knowledge that in the field of naval armaments NATO surpasses the Warsaw Pact in navy combat aircraft and the number of large surface ships, including aircraft-carriers. The Warsaw Pact has some advantage in submarines equipped with missiles and torpedoes. In view of the Vienna agreements, it would be logical to begin balancing the navy potentials of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the United States and the USSR.

The Soviet Union's stance on this problem has been consistent and definite. In pursuing the concept of the integrity of the disarmament process, it regards as inadmissible to leave naval armaments outside the talks. The parties to the talks should also be guided here by the concept of nonoffensive defence. The Soviet Union stands for finally excluding the possibility of a surprise attack at seas, too.

History of 'Demobilization' Studied

PM2407135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by G. Arbatov: "What Military Reform Has Given the Americans"]

[Text] The idea of writing this article came to me during a conversation that I had on 30 May this year, a few hours before M.S. Gorbachev's arrival in Washington for the summit. I had already been in the city for several days and had asked to be received by General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I wanted to speak with the general about his recent statements outlining reductions in military appropriations and arms. During the conversation the talk turned to other topics. The general said, in particular, that, knowing the complexities which the demobilization process in the USSR is encountering, he thought the U.S. experience might be of interest to us. Starting with demobilization after World War II and continuing up to the seventies, when the United States went over to a professional army roughly one-third smaller in numbers.

So, what interest does the U.S. experience hold?

Until World War II the United States took a simple approach to demobilization: terminal pay and a free ticket home. It took an incomparably more serious approach to demobilization in 1945. And not only because of the scale. Something else was the chief factor: concern at the possible social consequences of mass demobilization with regard to the experience provided by the world economic crisis. They feared mass unemployment, broad political discontent, and social upheavals. They also feared that restless and unsettled veterans might become the shock force of right-wing or left-wing extremism.

In addition, under Roosevelt the "captains" of U.S. capitalism had become enlightened enough to realize that the future of the United States was linked not only to the maintenance of internal civilian peace but also with the efficient utilization in the economy of the country's human resources released from the armed forces. A report by the Military Mobilization and Reconversion Agency pointed out that veterans "constitute the nucleus of the work force which we will need to achieve high levels of productivity." "The funds invested in training and instructing veterans," President F. Roosevelt emphasized, "will bring in a big profit with higher labor productivity."

A program to demobilize and adapt veterans began to be drawn up in the United States long before the end of the war—the basic work was done between 1942 and 1944. On 22 June 1944, after unanimous approval in both chambers of Congress (a rare event in U.S. history), a special draft law—the "soldier's bill of rights," as it was nicknamed—became law.

This was a thorough, well-thought-out system of guarantees aimed at creating the most favorable conditions for

"accustoming" demobilized soldiers to peaceful life. The chief emphasis was placed on employing and educating them.

Demobilized soldiers had the right to return to the same workplace from which they were drafted into the Army or to a similar one. Of 15 million war veterans, 5.8 million took advantage of that right. Demobilized soldiers were also guaranteed payment of one year's enhanced unemployment benefit (8.9 million took advantage). And, finally, the right to continue education in secondary or higher schools for four years with the state paying the cost of education, or technical or vocational training in firms and enterprises at state expense. Of the 7.8 million veterans covered by those programs, 2.2 million went to universities and colleges, 3.5 million continued their studies in secondary schools, and the rest received training in firms.

In addition, other benefits were envisaged for demobilized soldiers—in obtaining loans, purchasing and leasing housing, paying taxes, setting up their own business, etc.

What did these measures yield? In 1956 a special state commission summed up the detailed results of the first 10 years of this program's operation in the report "Veterans in Our Society." It turned out that former demobilized soldiers not only caught up with but also noticeably overtook their own colleagues who had not served in the Army in terms of professional standards, qualifications, and basic indicators of the standard of living. Need I say how useful these trained cadres later proved to the United States under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution which soon got under way!

I do not wish to draw any parallels here (although from my personal experience I recall the somewhat difficult position of Patriotic War veterans; they have only been remembered in recent years). Our countries' material potentials were too different and incomparable. And yet the multifaceted concern and the approach to the problem do, I believe, merit attention.

Regarding the U.S. military reform of the seventies, it was probably the most difficult period for the U.S. Armed Forces in their postwar history. The humiliating defeat in the inglorious Vietnam war, the involvement of the Army and the National Guard in crushing social unrest, the senseless waste of human and material resources—this all brought down a barrage of criticism on the Army. The wastefulness, machinations, and abuses which were brought to light within the military-industrial complex still further undermined the prestige of the U.S. military. From being a privileged stratum accustomed to having a free rein over almost half the federal budget, by the early seventies it had become the target of concentrated criticism. The public demanded the abolition of compulsory military service, a sharp cut in military spending, and democratic reform in the Army. The administration was forced to make a serious cut in the military budget—from $118 billion in 1968 (in terms of 1974 dollars) to $74 billion in 1974.

How did the Pentagon react to this? Its leaders realized with understandable displeasure and irritation that in that situation the only way to keep the Army fit for combat was to embark on the path of reform. A system of measures aimed at reducing costs in the Army and restoring its public prestige was quickly drawn up.

The Armed Forces were transferred from a draft to a professional (hired) basis, which made it possible to reduce the number of personnel by 1.2 million men (or 35 percent), i.e. 18 percent below the pre-Vietnam level, by 1974 by raising servicemen's professional standards. Reliance on reserve formations increased.

The Pentagon quickly got rid of old weapons and closed down secondary bases and other military installations (approximately 500 on U.S. territory alone). Handsome savings were provided by a reduction in the staff strength of senior officers and staffs, the amalgamation or elimination of a number of commands, and a reduction in administrative-managerial spending. The system of orders and arms purchase (called the "Packard reform") became more efficient and less costly. The containment of spending on strategic arms as a result of agreements with the Soviet Union also helped (according to R. Nixon's estimate, SALT I saved the United States approximately $15 billion).

The Pentagon's accountability to Congress increased, and the latter began to play an active independent role not only in determining the size of the military budget and monitoring its implementation but also in all building of the Armed Forces. Other, nonstate centers of civilian expertise were also activated; public debates on military questions became the norm of life.

All this helped to break negative trends for the Armed Forces and to emerge from the grave crisis by the mid-seventies: The intensity of public criticism began to fall, and the Army's prestige began to be restored.

I would like to speak quite briefly about the provision made for demobilized U.S. servicemen. In addition to the ordinary pension due to all citizens, servicemen with 20 or more years' service are paid a special military pension at the rate of 2.5 percent of their wage for every year of service. The wage during the last year before leaving the Army used to be taken as the basis, but now it is the average wage over any three years of highest-paid service. Thus, those who have served 20 years in the Army receive 50 percent of their highest wage, and those with 30 years—75 percent.

In addition, a special life assurance program is provided for servicemen. Simultaneously with signing the contract, those entering service also acquire, as a rule, an insurance policy paid for by the military department.

Almost all assistance for veterans comes out of federal funds. It is concentrated in the hands of the DVA

[Department of Veterans' Affairs] (until recently an administration, a federal agency directly subordinate to the President). In 1989 the department's budget totaled $29.5 billion. The two chief items of DVA expenditure are compensation and pension payments to veterans and their families ($15.7 billion in 1989) and the cost of medical aid ($10.3 billion).

Veterans can obtain medical aid through a network of medical establishments belonging to the DVA, which includes 172 hospitals, 236 health centers, 12 rehabilitation clinics with nursing care, 27 clinics which provide assistance at places of residence, and 188 medical centers for veterans.

Housing aid for veterans has been increasing somewhat in recent years. It almost all consists of loans guaranteed by the DVA. In 1989 232,600 veterans were able to obtain mortgages with these loans. By the end of the eighties the total payments on mortgages guaranteed by the DVA was estimated at $18 billion.

I wish again to stipulate that, given the big difference in the size of the gross national income and the population's living standards, it would be absurd to urge that we copy the Americans. The differences in pay and pension provision for our own and U.S. workers and employees are as great as they are for the military.

But it is an important fact—and this deserves to be imitated—that war veterans and veterans of the Armed Forces in the United States enjoy traditionally special attention and are provided with special benefits with regard to the difficulties of service and, after demobilization, to the complexity of adapting to a new life.

Unfortunately, we do not have such traditions. It is clear now that something must be done. But the argument is over this question: At whose expense, who must pay?

I believe that this is the wrong aspect of the argument. It is clear that the state must be in a position to pay for all the needs of the Armed Forces, which it considers it necessary to maintain. But also to determine the size of them. The whole point is that, owing to economic difficulties, including those resulting from overstraining the country in connection with the huge military spending (18 percent of national income!), there is nowhere to find additional funds. Just as for agriculture, education, health care, and other social needs, where the situation is also critical.

Therefore appropriations for the Armed Forces themselves are the most important source of funds. In the course of their planned reduction it is important not only to allocate a sufficient proportion of the funds released to the social protection of demobilized servicemen but also to carry out a redistribution within the defense budget. To spend less on buying weapons and on developing and producing new kinds of weapons, and more on people, on their training and maintenance, and on arranging their daily life. As well as on their pensions, apartments, and, when necessary, their requalification.

It is clear that there is one path to this—military reform. Carefully thought out and subjected to serious discussion. But this will take a certain time.

The question of the fate of demobilized servicemen is becoming increasingly acute and painful. How and where are we to settle those who do not have their own home or satisfactory housing? How are we to employ those who do not have a civilian specialty? How to provide them with decent prosperity? Are they discharged fairly, or are "refractory" people demobilized, and is short shrift given to those who dare to take glasnost and perestroyka seriously and to express their opinion in a hard-hitting way?

These and other problems arising among demobilized servicemen (as well as those returning from East European countries) can only be resolved, it seems, within the framework of a special statewide program.

It must be urgently drawn up through the joint efforts of the military department, the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the union republics, and the government under the direct supervision of the Presidential Council. It seems to me that international cooperation can also facilitate the resolution of a number of problems. In particular, in providing officers with housing and in requalifying them. There are corresponding proposals. How will we look on this, and will certain comrades not raise a fuss because someone is helping to "dismantle the Army" with the help of foreign "enemies"? I believe that we must not yield to pressure from demagogues and fears but take a serious look at the question.

Above all because this is a great human problem—it is a question of the life and destiny of hundreds of thousands of officers and ensigns and their families.

It is also a problem of the country's defense capability. Demobilization is a natural finale, the inevitable conclusion to a military man's career, about which he must think even during his comparatively young years. This means that the fate of demobilized servicemen is an important component of troop morale and of the human factor, whose role only grows as military hardware improves.

Finally, this is an important political problem. Dissatisfaction and discontent with living conditions on the part of officers and ensigns and lack of concern for demobilized servicemen could become the object of malicious speculation and of attempts to jeopardize the country's political stability at a crucial stage in its history. This cannot be permitted.

Bush Opposes 'Inordinate' Cuts

LD2607114190 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington July 26 TASS—U.S. President George Bush held a regular meeting with congressional

leaders at the White House on Wednesday, continuing talks between the administration and legislators on slashing the huge federal budget deficit.

The meeting concentrated on the 1991 Pentagon defence authorisation bill, to be more precise on an attempt to hammer out a compromise on how much to cut the budget. Judging by the results of the meeting, a compromise is still far away.

According to White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater, the president conveyed "his concern about inordinate cuts" that legislators want to make.

The Senate Armed Services Committee proposed on July 13 that the Pentagon budget should be $289 billion or $18 billion less than the initial request by the administration.

The House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, which will begin discussing its draft on July 31, proposes more substantial cuts.

"We must remember there have been few changes in Soviet strategic forces. On the contrary, they are continuing to modernise their entire force and will enter the START negotiations fully modernised," Bush warned congressional leaders.

"It is their stratetic nuclear forces which make the Soviets a superpower. In brief, if we want to continue to be able to defend our interest and if we mean to remain a force for stability and freedom, then we must have effective military capabilities."

Congress, Pentagon Debate Issue

PM2607150190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent V Gan: "New Answer for a New World: Battle Over B-2 in U.S. Congress"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Jul—There is no way the latest U.S. B-2 bomber, which is claimed to be invisible to enemy radar, can "make its way" through the obstacles erected in its path by... the U.S. Congress.

Les Aspin, chairman of the influential House Armed Services Committee and a very authoritative voice in military matters on Capitol Hill, has just joined the critics of what is probably the Pentagon's most expensive program.

The financial factor is undoubtedly present in the congressman's considerations. Judge for yourselves—one such bomber costs approximately $840 million. The Pentagon would like to obtain, in all, 75 B-2's at a total cost of $62.8 billion. At a time when the country just cannot see "light at the end of the tunnel" of huge budget deficits, such arithmetic is making more than one legislator scratch his head.

And yet I believe that something else is most important. The rapid change in the very philosophy of Soviet-U.S. relations, the specific steps to demilitarize them, and the recession of the "threat from the East" into the past have had a tangible effect on the whole atmosphere in which the Pentagon's requests are traditionally discussed. Two weeks ago, for example, the Senate Armed Services Committee headed by Sam Nunn—certainly no liberal—voted to allocate $289 billion for military purposes in the next fiscal year, or $18 billion less than the administration is requesting. Certain major programs went under the knife—something unheard of—while others were slowed up abruptly, and it is proposed to reduce the strength of the Armed Forces by 100,000 men.

The change in the stand taken by the committee chairman who previously supported the program to create "invisible" aircraft seems a natural evolution of his views. And, in fact, he does not hide this. The question, he says, is this: "How to determine the extent and form of U.S. defense when the Soviet Union does not threaten it?" And this is why, in Aspin's opinion, the United States needs a totally different military concept.

It would, of course, be premature to predict that the so-called "old school"—Aspin, incidentally, numbers Defense Secretary Cheney in this—will dutifully retire. It is true that fresh winds of change are reaching even the Pentagon, but this is an extremely difficult and painful process. It was probably no coincidence that, following Aspin's announcement of his decision, forecasts came thick and fast from all sides about a "real battle" over the B-2, notably between the two Armed Services Committees of Congress.

It is easy to guess what role Pentagon chief Cheney will play in this battle. Cheney makes no secret of his liking for the "hawk" label. At a recent meeting with correspondents the secretary imparted the information that he had drawn up a list of ten actions which the USSR must undertake so that Cheney can see for himself that "the Soviets have really changed fundamentally and are moving in the direction of creating on a permanent basis a less threatening and less hostile force as regards the United States." In reply to journalists' questions as to what steps specifically he would like to see the Soviet side take, the secretary gave a cunning smile: "I am adding to my list all the time. Every time they take a particular step, I immediately add a new one."

Although Cheney's words gladdened some people, they are no joke. They show a reluctance or an inability to take an unbiased, broad look at the new Soviet Union and the new world.

U.S. Outdated 'Cold War Rhetoric' Viewed

LD2607123390 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—Are the Soviet Union and the United States enemies or friends? How far have changes in their mutual relations gone? A week ago these questions seemed easy to answer: The cold war is over, East and West have extended hands of friendship to each other and the era of cooperation has begun, as illustrated by numerous official statements by the leaders of the United States, the Soviet Union, NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Suffice it to recall just two moments. First, the historic phrase Mikhail Gorbachev said to George Bush on Malta: The Soviet Union is prepared not to view the United States as its enemy. Second, the reciprocal step by the U.S. President during the Washington summit: The Soviet Union can proceed from the fact that the United States will never threaten its security.

It was perfectly clear that the time was ripe for the two countries to begin new relations. Special hopes were encouraged by the London declaration of NATO member-countries.

However, recent signals from the United States cause apprehension. The wording of George Bush's recent speeches is reminiscent of cold war rhetoric—peace from positions of strength, policy of confrontation and the like.

On July 24, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater astounded journalists at a briefing by saying that the Soviet Union remained an enemy against which the United States needed to arm itself. The answer was all the more surprising because the Pentagon did not describe the Soviet Union as an enemy in its latest release on the Soviet military might.

Fitzwater said the main reason was that the Soviet Union had not changed the structure of its strategic forces. This argument has no logic. Has the United States made any radical changes in the structure of its strategic forces? Does it not continue modernising its forces? Why does Washington deny the Soviet Union a right it claims for the Pentagon?

Fitzwater's statements are inconsistent. He ruptures the link between the assessment of what states do in the military field and the agreed disarmament process.

He does this at a time when a favourable situation has emerged, largely due to the Soviet Union's constructive approach, at talks on strategic offensive weapons and conventional arms in Europe.

This situation promotes the mutual reduction and limitation of the stockpiles at the disposal of the Soviet Union, the United States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The U.S. Administration's desire to preserve the country's defence capabilities and the stability of the strategic situation is understandable.

One would like to believe that the White House is being guided by this concern in its present debates with the Congress about the new military budget.

Nevertheless, questions continue to arise: "Is it wise to use outdated rhetoric? Will this approach not cause serious damage to the growing East-West trust?

Shevardnadze Awarded U.S. Anti-War Prize

LD2607051290 Moscow TASS in English 0507 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS special correspondent Andrey Sitov]

[Text] Seattle July 26 TASS—Soviet Presidential Council member and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has been awarded the U.S. Ralph Bunche anti-war prize for his great contribution to strengthening peace among nations through respect for the norms of international law.

This distinction is annually conferred by two professional associations of lawyers from the state of Washington.

The prize, which has been for the first time awarded to a Soviet person, was named after a prominent American diplomat who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1950 for promoting the Arab-Israeli armistice in Palestine under the aegis of the United Nations.

U.S. Space Group Assesses Soviet Rocket Use

LD2507123490 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] A group of American space explorers and space technology designers has visited this country to sound out the possibilities of using the superpowerful Soviet Energiya rocket in American space projects. Energiya can put loads of up to 100 tonnes into orbit. In an interview after the talks in Moscow, one of the delegation members, [words indistinct] of the American Institute for Space Studies, said the discussions ended quite favorably. The sides found out that it was possible to launch an American satellite to the moon by the Soviet rocket to study natural resources of that planet.

Estonian Russians, Senator Discuss Representation

90UN2230A SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by K. Muuli for EDAZI: "What the Talk Was About"]

[Text] At about 1600 on Sunday [3 June], a dozen or so journalists were waiting impatiently in the Union of Journalists in Estonia for the start of Senator Dennis DeConcini's news conference; however, the senator was late. In the end, the organizers of the meeting reported that Mr. DeConcini, who was heading a commission on preparation for the Helsinki conference, was conversing at APN [Novosti Press Agency] with Intermovement and

OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives] members Anatoliy Zybin and Vladimir Lebedev.

Several minutes later, a couple of inquisitive reporters were already ringing the door bell of the APN building. They were politely informed that journalists were not being allowed into the meeting. After a half hour, Mr. DeConcini left the APN premises, and Anatoliy Zybin and Vladimir Lebedev kindly agreed to answer journalists' questions.

It turns out that while still in the United States, Dennis DeConcini had sent Intermovement and OSTK a telefax requesting a meeting. The senator allegedly was interested in what the state of affairs is in Estonia with respect to guaranteeing individual rights for the Russian population and its social protection.

"He was also interested in the attitude of our movement toward the independence of Estonia and the right of the people to self-determination. We informed him of our point of view, and, I suppose that... everything is still ahead of us," remarked V. Lebedev with satisfaction.

Responding to the question of who should represent Estonia at the Helsinki conference, Vladimir Lebedev declared that the question in the documents of the last conference concerns people and not nations. "We think that a large part of the Russian community must be included in the concept of the Estonian people," he said.

"Representation of the Estonian people at the Helsinki conference is necessary, but in the conversation with the senator we did not go into this question deeply, inasmuch as the senator was more interested in why the Russian population here was worried about its position. We cited specific examples of discrimination for him that are manifested even at the level of the leadership of the republic," V. Lebedev reported.

V.A. Zybin declared that the Estonian delegation to Helsinki must represent the entire Estonian people, and not just one part of it—Estonians. "It is agreed that Intermovement can participate in the Helsinki conference, but the delegation must be constituted on principles of parity," insisted A. Zybin.

"We have something to talk about in Helsinki," Vladimir Lebedev believes. "If the representatives of the Estonians start to talk first of all about relations with the central authority, then we will talk about relations in the republic. Just the fact that the president of the republic did not come out on the balcony before the representatives of the Russian population, and the people were told that he was not there and, apparently, would not be there until the following day, when two hours later he appeared before another part of the population, demonstrates the kind of a state policy we have."

Anatoliy Zybin and Vladimir Lebedev came out for a referendum on Estonian independence.

"I was born in Estonia, and I lived here until the war. I am confident that part of the Estonians do not want separation from the USSR. They want to plant, grow, and sell, and they do not need Savisaar," A. Zybin believes.

"Why are many against the referendum?" Vladimir Lebedev asked himself in amazement. "We can invite independent observers, and, I believe, that military deputies could organize the matter in such a way that during the referendum not one soldier will leave the garrisons. But before the referendum, the people must receive a full and objective picture of what awaits them in one or the other case. I am confident that it is more advantageous for the Estonian people to be in a federation of 15 republics, and not under conditions of a center—14 republics. In a federation where all 15 republics are joined by a mutual treaty. If detailed information is provided, then the result of a referendum will be half-and-half," Vladimir Lebedev thinks.

A. Zybin and V. Lebedev declared at the end of the interview that before their meeting with the U.S. senator there was somewhat of a one-sided view of what was occurring in Estonia. During the meeting, his view changed. At least, Dennis DeConcini himself assured them of this.

Lithuanian Vice Premier Arrives in Washington

LD2507173890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Algirdas Brazauskas, vice premier of the Republic of Lithuania, and Raimondas Rajeckas, deputy president of the Academy of Sciences, continuing their visit to the United States, arrived in Washington today. Here they intend to meet with representatives of the Department of Trade, of an insurance corporation, and of some banks.

According to reports, Algirdas Brazauskas is to be received by George Bush. We shall obtain more specific information about this.

'Dartmouth' Meeting in Leningrad Ends 25 Jul

LD2607133890 Moscow TASS in English 1257 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Leningrad July 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko and Aleksandr Rachko:

The 17th Dartmouth meeting, which ended in Leningrad on Wednesday [25 July], discussed a broad range of political, economic and social issues. It was attended by members of the public from the Soviet Union and the United States.

The final plenary meeting summed up the results of discussions held in working groups. The agenda covered such topics as the preservation of peace, disarmament, regional conflicts and prospects for the development of economic and humanitarian relations.

Forum participants expressed satisfaction with the frank and constructive dialogue and agreed that, despite difficulties in the two countries, it is high time to make Soviet-U.S. cooperation more dynamic.

It was stressed that this process is promoted by positive changes in the USSR and international detente.

China

CPSU, China's Communist Party Discuss Ties

PM2607135190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 25 July G.I. Yanayev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received a delegation of the CPC Central Committee International Liaison Department headed by Li Shuzheng, candidate member of the CPC Central Committee and deputy head of the department. Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, also participated in the meeting.

In the course of friendly talks G.I. Yanayev spoke about the present stage of the transformations in the Soviet Union, the political results of the work of the 28th CPSU Congress, and the practical tasks of communists stemming from its decisions. He pointed out that the congress made it possible to preserve the party's unity on the basis of its adherence to the socialist choice and the communist prospect and created conditions for turning the CPSU into the real vanguard of perestroyka.

Both sides emphasized the importance of deepening ties and exchanging opinions and experience between the CPSU and the CPC. Interparty contacts make a substantial contribution to the process of the dynamic development of Soviet-Chinese relations in all spheres and the strengthening of friendship and good-neighborliness between the two countries' peoples.

During its stay in the USSR the Chinese delegation held talks at the CPSU Central Committee International Department, had discussions at other Central Committee departments and Moscow City party committee, and made trips to Leningrad and Minsk.

PRC Group Visits Newly Opened Maritime Area

OW2707000990 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 14 Jul 90

[From the "Soviet Union Today" program]

[Excerpt] The Maritime Territory, a vast region in the Soviet Far East, is energetically developing links with the various provinces, municipalities, and cities of neighboring China. Vladivostok, the capital of the Maritime Territory, which was closed to foreigners until recently, has eagerly opened its doors in an effort to foster mutual cooperation and friendly exchanges. A delegation from China's Heilongjiang Province, headed by Sun Weiben, member of the CPC Central Committee and first secretary of the Heilongjiang Provincial CPC Committee, visited Vladivostok recently. (Zolin), secretary of the Maritime Territory CPSU Committee, met with the visitors. The Soviet and Chinese comrades discussed party building efforts in their respective countries. The Soviet comrades briefed their Chinese counterparts on the major activities carried out by their grass-roots party organizations within the framework of reform, and the Chinese comrades gave a similar account in the context of economic restructuring. Both sides called for expanding contacts between party organizations at all levels in the Maritime Territory and Heilongjiang Province. In reviewing his meeting and talks with Vladivostok leaders, Comrade Sun Weiben made the following comment to a station reporter:

[Begin Sun recording] The main purpose of our trip to Vladivostok was to establish contact with the leading comrades of the Maritime Territory, and to improve mutual understanding in an effort to strengthen future ties. We also wanted to learn the intentions of the Maritime Territory party committee and government regarding mutual cooperation in the future. Although the trip was very short, we successfully completed our mission. There were spirited discussions between the two sides. Speaking in terms of percentage, I would say that our mission was 120 percent successful because, in addition to our original mission, we saw the sights of beautiful Vladivostok City in the company of Maritime Territory leaders, came in contact with people from all walks of life in the Soviet Union, and arrived at an understanding of their lifestyles. It can be said that we overfulfilled our task. [end recording]

Comrade Sun Weiben invited the leaders in the Maritime Territory to return his visit in order to map out plans for further strengthening friendly ties and mutual cooperation between adjoining regions of the Soviet Union and China. [passage omitted]

Northeast Asia

Further on Visit by Japanese Group

Lukyanov Discusses Relations

LD2507174190 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 25 TASS—Chairman of the Soviet parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov today received a visiting delegation of the Japanese parliament, headed by Chamber of Representatives Chairman Yoshio Sakarauchi.

They discussed current processes in the world, Soviet perestroyka and the state of, and prospects for the development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Lukyanov noted that the visit coincided with the great changes in the world—the international community is overcoming confrontational feelings, the danger of a nuclear war has been averted and the world is searching for ways to resolve global problems facing the humanity.

Deep changes in the political, economic and spiritual spheres are radically modifying the Soviet society. The structure and activities of the higher state and government bodies in the Soviet Union has been seriously reorganised and their power has increased. At the same time, republics' sovereignty and independence have strengthened and local bodies became more active, Lukyanov said.

Lukyanov noted the role of Soviet-Japanese relations in fostering the world political processes. He said the Soviet Union favoured strengthening goodneighbourly ties with Japan and was ready to develop relations, based on the principle of equality. He said he was satisfied with the advancement of positive trends in bilateral relations and the improvement of their atmosphere.

The Japanese delegation was told that the Soviet parliament was ready to cooperate with the Japanese parliament actively and creatively to promote the development of Soviet-Japanese tiese in the interest of security and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and the whole world.

Sakarauchi noted the usefulness of parliamentary contacts that could enrich bilateral relations and promote the solution of the most important international and regional problems.

Lukyanov said he hoped the visit would be useful for the solution of these problems and wished success to the Japanese people and state leadership.

Later in the day, the delegation met chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of the Union Ivan Laptev. They discussed the development of bilateral economic ties.

Gorbachev, Group Head Discuss Islands

LD2607165190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has met the chairman of the House of Representatives of the Japanese parliament, Mr. Yoshio Sakurauchi, and the discussion naturally focused on the state and prospects of bilateral ties. Aleksandr Pogodin comments: The meeting again revealed fundamental differences in how the two countries view these issues. President Gorbachev explained that since Japan was the Soviet Union's neighbor the USSR would like to have good relations with it, relations that would be better than now. Both countries need to apply efforts in search for ways to bring their positions closer, if they are to make their ties better.

However, the Japanese side reemphasized the issue of the so-called northern territories; four Kuril Islands owned by the USSR but being claimed by Japan. Such territorial claims are completely against the intenational decisions made on the basis of postwar realities. The Soviet Union has been acting in strict compliance with these decisions and international law.

I don't want to develop discussion on the problem that has been repeatedly discussed with Japanese representatives, the USSR president stressed, and I can repeat today that we have no territorial question. For one thing this was conspicuous during the last meeting of the seven industrialized Western countries where the possibility of helping the USSR to carry out economic reforms was under consideration. The Japanese position was very tough; without a transfer of northern territories there could be no talk about aid.

Needless to prove that the language of blackmail is totally unacceptable in international affairs. Quite logically, President Gorbachev questioned the expediency of his scheduled trip to Japan if during the visit the northern territories issue would be the only one on the agenda. We are for good relations, the president said, but regrettably they are not marked with dynamics today. In time we may understand each other better.

Strong Ties Advocated

OW2707032190 Tokyo KYODO in English 0231 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 27 KYODO—A top aide to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev told a Japanese parliamentary delegation Thursday that strong economic ties between the Soviet Union and Japan are needed to settle a bilateral territorial dispute, according to Japanese sources here.

Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the Presidential Council and a key Gorbachev aide, made the remarks in talks with a suprapartisan Diet delegation led by House of Representatives speaker Yoshio Sakurauchi.

The Sakurauchi mission is in Moscow on a four-day visit through Friday.

Yakovlev said settlement of the territorial issue over Etorofu, Kunashiri, Shikotan and the Habomais off eastern Hokkaido in northern Japan depends on whether or not Moscow and Tokyo vitalize economic ties.

On Wednesday, Gorbachev told Sakurauchi that a territorial issue over the four islands does not exist. The Soviet Union has held the four islands since the closing days of World War II.

Ruling Party in Japan Wants Tax Reform Debate

OW2607124690 Tokyo KYODO in English 0839 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 26 KYODO—The ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) wants to see an extraordinary Diet session called in October to tackle the controversial

tax reform issue pending full debate in a joint government-opposition consultative panel, an LDP official said here Thursday.

Kanezo Muraoka, chairman of the LDP's Diet steering committee, made the statement to Japanese reporters covering a Japanese multiparty parliamentary delegation visiting here.

The consultative body was set up to end the hiatus involving the three percent consumption tax after the Diet closed on June 26, shelving both the ruling party-sponsored bill for revision of the tax and a package of opposition bills aimed at killing it.

Muraoka said his party wants the Diet to go into a special session by October after finalizing debates on the consumption tax, introduced on April 1 last year, in the consultative panel the preceding month.

It would be difficult to convene such a Diet meeting after mid-November as a series of coronation rites for Emperor Akihito are due to be held, he said.

Atsushi Kanda, chairman of the Diet steering committee of the Democratic Socialist Party (DSP) and his counterpart in the Komeito, Hiroichi Sakai, favored to finalize the tax issue within this year in time for the compilation of the next fiscal 1991 budget.

However, Shun Oide and Iwao Teramae, chairman of the Diet steering committee of the Japan Socialist Party (JSP) and the Japan Communist Party (JCP), respectively expressed opposition to the LDP idea, saying it would not be so easy to hammer out differences in opinions on the controversial issue so soon.

Japan, RSFSR Trade Cooperation Memo Signed

LD2707110890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] A memorandum on cooperation has been adopted at the working meeting of the Council of Minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the Japanese-Soviet trade association, which has ended in Vladivostok.

The topics discussed included the prospect of partnership in the working of natural resources and the creation of free enterprise zones on the republic's territory.

DPRK Delegation's Visit to Seoul Reported

SK2607042190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 25 Jul 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" feature]

[Text] A DPRK delegation will arrive in Seoul tomorrow for preparations of the pan-national rally for reunification of Korea. As has been reported, the South Korean authorities have agreed with the DPRK's proposal for holding the rally on 15 August at Panmunjom. They also plan to conduct a joint march for peace in Korea and its reunification which will pass through the territory of South Korea. This joint march will be conducted on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the liberation of the country from the Japanese colonial rule.

According to a report from Seoul, the DPRK delegation will meet with representatives of various organizations in South Korea which have advocated the peaceful reunification of Korea.

More on DPRK Poaching Case, Plan for Appeal

PM2607114190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Report by Yu. Balakirev and V. Vladimirov under the rubric "Returning to Previous Reports": "Once Again About International Poachers' Vessels"]

[Text] Vladivostok-Moscow—As we have reported already (IZVESTIYA Nos. 187, 189, 196), fishery protection organs and the Nakhodka Prosecutor's Office disagreed with the decision of the city court in discontinuing proceedings in the case of illegal salmon fishing under the DPRK flag in a convention region of the Pacific. Complaints from representatives of basin fishery inspectorates and a protest by the Nakhodka prosecutor were sent to the Maritime Kray Court. After examining the materials submitted, the civil division under the chairmanship of V. Razhayev set aside the city court decision.

Our correspondent in Vladivostok asked V. Razhayev to comment on that decision.

"In its decision, the Nakhodka court relied on one of the points in the Soviet-Korean Mixed Fishery Commission regulations signed in 1985 on the basis of the 1974 intergovernmental agreement. But a new agreement on cooperation in the fishery sphere was reached between the USSR and the DPRK in the spring of 1987. That act superseded the earlier accord."

It is two months since the international poachers were arrested. Under an accord with the Korean side, the vessels have been released from Nakhodka to the DPRK port of Hungnam on a security of $3 million. Our inspectorate ship Kherluf Bidstrup is there now. A final calculation of the damage done is being made. Every salmon caught will cost the Korean fishermen 300 rubles [R]. This is indisputable. The juridical dispute is over too. A repeat session of the Nakhodka City Court has just been held. The Far East Fishery Protection Agency's action has now been satisfied. According to the present decision, the captain of each poaching vessel must pay a fine of R100,000. The vessels, the fishing tackle, and the catch itself are confiscated. However, we were told at the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry that the Korean fishermen disagree with that decision and intend to appeal against it.

Troop Withdrawal From Mongolia Ahead of Schedule

LD2707105490 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 27 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar July 27 TASS—Colonel D. Dorzhgotov, first deputy chief of the General Staff of the Mongolian People's Army, answered questions concerning the Soviet troop withdrawal at a news conference at the Mongolian Foreign Ministry.

In March this year the two countries' governments are known to have decided on the final withdrawal of Soviet troops that had been in Mongolia temporarily at the request of the Mongolian Government.

"The withdrawal is now proceeding ahead of schedule. Eighty-two percent of Soviet servicemen have already returned home now," the Mongolian spokesman said.

"Another several units are preparing to withdraw. Soviet troops have completley left the cities of Nalaikha, Sainshad, and Choibalsan.

"Fifty-two military townships, about 300 barrarcks and 30 military hospitals have been turned over to Mongolia free of charge," Dorzhgotov said.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further on U.S. Change in Policy on Cambodia

'Derecognition' of Khmer Rouge Hailed

OW2607140690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Commentary by Alekseyev from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The U.S. Government has said that its decision to withdraw recognition of Cambodia's tripartite coalition government is prompted by a desire to prevent the Khmer Rouge regime from returning to power. Some nations have indicated their intentions to follow in the U.S.' footsteps. Station observer Alekseyev has the following comment:

How is the derecognition of the tripartite Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea related to the prevention of the Khmer Rouge from seizing political power? The Khmer Rouge plays a crucial role in the coalition government. Its military strength is greater than the combined military power of the other two opposition factions, respectively led by Sihanouk and Son Sann. Currently, Khmer Rouge troops are actively engaged in a massive offensive against the Phnom Penh government troops. More importantly, the Khmer Rouge leaders have rejected truce proposals and openly declared their intention to seize Cambodia's political power by military force. The tripartite coalition government is, in effect, a fake signboard under which the Khmer Rouge tries to realize its ambitions. The tragedy of the past may befall the Cambodian people again. It should be noted that the Khmer Rouge killed more than three million of its fellow countrymen in the past.

Some people who shelter the Khmer Rouge say the leaders of that coalition faction have forsaken radical views that formed the ideological underpinnings of their genocidal policy of the past. These are only propaganda. Former U.S. Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, who recently visited Cambodia, has said that the Khmer Rouge still believes in its genocidal concepts and policies, adding that any remarks portraying it as leaning toward humanitarism do not correspond with the facts. Therefore, we should try our best to prevent the Khmer Rouge from returning to political power. Preventing the bloody, genocidal regime from staging a comeback in Cambodia is indeed the obligation of all those who fight for the destiny, interests, and aspirations of the Cambodian people. It is also an internationally acknowledged task that has a direct bearing on the mediation of the Cambodian issue. The U.S. decision to stop recognizing the so-called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, which is dominated by the Khmer Rouge, no doubt will assist in the completion of this task.

Reactions Vary

PM2707085190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Petr Tsvetov from "Viewpoint": "Why They Are Against It"]

[Text] The United States declared last week that it no longer recognizes the tripartite coalition headed by Norodom Sihanouk as Cambodia's representative at the United Nations. A positive assessment was made of this step in many countries.

And not by chance. For, if this step by the United States and other UN member countries (particularly permanent members of the Security Council) means that Cambodia's UN seat falls vacant, new opportunities will open up to advance the cause of settling a chronic regional conflict. Thanks to this decision, the United Nations and its members will demonstrate their equitable, impartial attitude toward the chief protagonists in the confrontation in the Cambodian political arena—the coalition government headed by Sihanouk and the government in Phnom Penh headed by Hun Sen. This being so, the participation of external forces in resolving Cambodia's problems will be more effective and acceptable to the Phnom Penh government, which controls 90 percent of the country's territory. Incidentally, Hun Sen and his government had demanded of the international organization the impartiality expressed in deeming Cambodia's UN seat vacant.

But the ASEAN foreign ministers who met in Jakarta recently adopted a joint statement condemning the U.S. Administration's pivotal decision. "Cambodia's representation at the United Nations is a delicate political

question, and attempts to change it at the present time could slow down the settlement process," the leaders of the foreign policy departments of Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Brunei pointed out in the joint document.

Figuratively speaking, the ASEAN countries were present at the birth of the coalition of Cambodian opposition members, did all they could to save it from collapse, and supported its leader, Prince Sihanouk. And some people in ASEAN probably consider themselves bound by certain obligations to those forces.

But I believe that the U.S. Administration's positive move in a Cambodian settlement was given a hostile reception by ASEAN because of fear of a thaw in U.S.-Vietnamese relations—something which sober-minded people cannot fail to wish for and which could lead in the long run to the strengthening of Vietnam's positions in the region. If this is so and people in the ASEAN capitals cannot rid themselves of the stereotypes of old thinking, when a strong Vietnam was regarded as an inevitable threat to the countries of Southeast Asia, then such a stand will hinder the normalization of the situation in the region for a long time to come. There is far more "brake fluid" in suspicion and mistrust than in the consequences of decisions such as the U.S. Administration has adopted.

The fact that not everyone in the capitals of the Asia and Pacific basin thinks in the old way inspires optimism. Commenting on the reaction in the region to the U.S. secretary of state's statement regarding the Cambodian opposition, the Indonesian newspaper JAKARTA POST pointed out: "Washington's latest decision should not be seen as a shock but be regarded as an incentive to develop a favorable atmosphere in the region in the interests of all its countries." Lasting peace in Cambodia is the primary condition for such an atmosphere. All efforts must be directed toward this.

Near East & South Asia

More on Visit by Indian Prime Minister

Gorbachev, Singh Sign Economic Accord

BK2607032290 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0240 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] India and the Soviet Union have agreed to sign a wide-ranging economic treaty, which will provide for new forms of cooperation in science and technology and co-production. The treaty on peace, friendship, and cooperation between the two countries is also to be extended. This was agreed to between the Soviet president, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, and the prime minister, Mr. V.P. Singh, during their meeting in Moscow.

A spokesman of the external affairs ministry told newsmen in Tashkent yesterday that the signing of the economic treaty and extension of the friendship treaty will be timed to coincide with Mr. Gorbachev's visit to India. Quoting a front page article in Soviet newspaper PRAVDA, the spokesman said that it was agreed that the cooperation engendered by the treaty should not be confined only to higher echelons. It should extend to enterprises and unit levels to determine joint course of interaction. During the talks, both leaders confirmed the similarity of their positions on the Afghan situation. Mr. Gorbachev noted the constructive role played by India and the international significance of its contribution to normalize relations with its neighbors.

Singh Assesses Visit

LD2607203690 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kapustin]

[Text] New Delhi July 26 TASS—At a news conference in New Delhi's Palam Airport upon his arrival from Tashkent, Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh of the Republic of India said that he was not only satisfied but happy that the official friendly visit to the Soviet Union ended with such results.

He noted that as a result of the first Soviet-Indian summit after the national front government took office in India, the two countries' leaders formed good personal contacts.

Singh said that the visit was very successful in political terms. During the one-to-one talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev, deep mutual understanding was achieved both on international and bilateral issues. Singh said the political will to strengthen mutual ties was concretised and this was one of the visit's all-important achievements.

Singh said the two countries consolidated their relations of past years, which were epitomised in the Soviet-Indian treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation and also in the Delhi declaration on the principles of a nuclear weapons-free and non-violent world. But the two states are looking forward and they decided to conclude a new large-scale agreement either late this year or early next year when President Gorbachev pays a visit to India. Singh said the two countries intended to raise Soviet-Indian ties to new heights.

Touching on the policy of perestroyka and openness pursued in the USSR, Singh said India was eager to give a positive response to sweeping changes in the Soviet Union. In this regard, he noted the two countries' intention to create such a mechanism of interaction that would be consonant with the present-day realities.

Singh said India was interested in the success of perestroyka. India as well as the whole world will gain thanks Gorbachev's initiatives, since they modified the entire image of international relations. He emphasised that perestroyka envisaged wide democratisation and decentralisation and the Indian National Front government pursued exactly this path.

Indian Premier Returns Home

LD2607131490 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Tashkent July 26 TASS—Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh and officials accompanying him on an official visit to the USSR left the Uzbek capital for New Delhi today. Before returning to India the Indian delegation visited Bukhara and Samarkand, the oldest towns in Central Asia.

At Tashkent Airport Singh was seen off by Uzbek President Islam Karimov, Uzbek Prime Minister Shukurulla Miraidov, First Deputy Prime Minister of the USSR Lev Voronin, and other officials.

Ryzhkov Lauds Monument to Indian Poet

PM2607104790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Unveiling of Monument to Rabindranath Tagore"]

[Excerpt] The Indian sculptor Gautam Pal has made the Soviet capital and all admirers of Rabindranath Tagore's talent a fine gift. The well-known master from the friendly country is the author of a memorial to India's great son, unveiled in Moscow's Friendship Park 24 July. N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and V.P. Singh, prime minister of the Republic of India, participated in the ceremony.

Calling this a portentous event in the life of all Soviet people, the Soviet head of government expressed profound gratitude for this to the distinguished Indian guest.

Tagore holds a special place among the outstanding representatives of the Indian people, N.I. Ryzhkov emphasized—philosophers, politicians, religious and public figures, scientists, poets, artists, and musicians. He made a tremendous and multifaceted contribution to the development of his country's culture and art. He was the first Asian poet to receive the Nobel prize.

Rabindranath Tagore was an ardent adherent of the cause of his motherland's national liberation and, at the same time, a patriot of all mankind. As the times when he lived recede further and further from us, the greatness of his personality becomes increasingly clear.

Tagore's works revealed to Soviet people the soul of India, just as the works of Pushkin and Tolstoy revealed to Indians the soul of Russia. And this is probably one of the reasons why a memorial to Pushkin has been erected in Delhi, and it is intended to erect a memorial to Lev Tolstoy. Through Tagore's works we feel that the desire for beauty, harmony, and justice lives in the hearts of Indians. Tagore is and always will be close to us, because these desires lie at the basis of panhuman values.

Today the time has come when precisely these values must be reflected in politics. This is confirmed by the Delhi declaration on the principles of a nonviolent world free from nuclear weapons, which asserts the ideals of nonviolence, mutual understanding, and trust.

Contacts between the great peoples of the Soviet Union and India and our countries' cooperation embody the lofty ideals which Tagore brought to people. This is served by the Soviet-Indian political dialogue initiated 35 years ago by the visit to the Soviet Union of another great citizen of India—Jawaharlal Nehru. The present visit to our country by Mr. Singh, prime minister of India, continues this dialogue, which is particularly important today, since our countries are resolving largely similar problems.

In unveiling a memorial to India's great son we cannot fail to recall that Rabindranath Tagore was one of those who laid the foundations of Soviet-Indian friendship. He rated highly our country's contribution to panhuman culture.

The memorial erected in Friendship Park, N.I. Ryzhkov said in conclusion, will symbolize the Soviet people's profound respect for the memory of this outstanding humanist-artist, poet, and thinker, and at the same time it will be a symbol of the unity of the Soviet and Indian peoples. [passage omitted]

OPEC Ministers Meet, Discuss Iraq-Kuwait Crisis

NC2607114990 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] At a time when Iraq and Kuwait are experiencing political difficulties, the alternate session of the OPEC petroleum ministers is meeting in Geneva. Our analyst writes: Baghdad claims that Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates are stabbing Iraq in the back with a poisoned dagger, meaning that Iraq's income has dropped because of an increase in the oil production and sale quota of Arab members of OPEC.

If the production ceiling is not observed, not only Iraq but the other OPEC members are harmed. However, the other members do not threaten violators, but convey their concern to Kuwait and to the United Arab Emirates through diplomatic channels.

Moreover, relations between Kuwait and Iran have improved perceptibly during recent days, even though Iran supports Iraq's policy aimed at increasing oil prices, and even though not very long ago—during the Iran-Iraq war—Iranian artillery and missiles hit Kuwaiti territory and attacked Kuwaiti tankers at sea.

Some observers consider Iraq's dissatisfaction with the normalization of relations between Iran and Kuwait to be the reason for the emergence of tension in Iran-Iraq relations [as heard] and they claim that Kuwait is a (?bone of contention) between its two stronger neighbors in the Persian Gulf.

There are other comments too. For example, there are those who claim that by provoking tension with Kuwait and with the United Arab Emirates, Iraq is allegedly trying to refrain from repaying its debts to these countries who extended loans and oil to Iraq during the war. There are also others who believe that Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn considers the exacerbation of relations with Kuwait a way to strengthen his presidency. Those who voice this opinion refer to the Iraqi parliament's proposals on life-long presidency for the Iraqi leader.

These allegations are not sufficiently thought out. Lately, the Iran-Iraq peace talks have been progressing successfully. The two sides are moving toward an agreement on a number of important issues, namely the issue of sovereignty in the Shatt al-'Arab or Arvand Rud. It is not possible that the Kuwaiti problem and making this process more complicated benefits either Baghdad or Tehran. As for the opinion that the tension is being used to strengthen the president's position in Iraq, this view is illogical because it is not possible for Baghdad to be able to assume that the policy of pressuring Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates will definitely succeed. Also, such a policy cannot free Iraq from repaying its debts.

I am sure that oil is the reason for the tension between Iraq and Kuwait. Iraq and Iran's possibilities for oil export are more limited in comparison with the other Persian Gulf countries. Also, compared with Iran, Iraq is in a more unfavorable condition even though its oil exports to the Soviet Union and to East European countries can be done more easily. (?And this is) where Iraq's extremely negative reaction of harming OPEC's [word indistinct] policy stems from.

I think that Iraq should hide its feelings, for the sake of OPEC's unity and well-being, especially since both Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates have undertaken to observe the OPEC production ceiling [words indistinct].

Iranian Leader Thanks Azerbaijan for Aid

NC2507075690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 24 Jul 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] We reported yesterday that the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Moscow conveyed a message from President Hashemi-Rafsanjani to President Ayaz Mutalibov through the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic's permanent mission in the Soviet capital. In the message, Hashemi-Rafsanjani thanked Mutalibov for Azerbaijan's efforts to alleviate the sufferings in Iran caused by the recent earthquake.

Today's newspapers publish a report on the message.

Tensions in Lebanon Assume 'Massive Proportions'

NC2607222390 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Andreyev]

[Excerpts] Esteemed listeners, the situation in southern Lebanon is extraordinarily complicated. It is eleven days now since fierce battles have erupted between the armed units of the Shiite faction Amal and the pro-Iran Hizballah faction. These battles are continuing.

The events in southern Lebanon are assuming catastrophic form every moment. Once again violence and fury are rising to a peak and the blood of innocent and defenseless people is being spilled. Military operations between the Amal organization and the Hizballah grouping are assuming massive proportions. [passage omitted]

Despite the fact that the Amal and Hizballah are two representatives of the interests of a single religious society in Lebanon, contradictions and deep differences have created a wide chasm between them. It is obvious that in this regard the slogan of Shiite unity is nothing more than a myth, as has been proven in Lebanon and cannot ever emerge successfully from the crucible of practical experience.

Today, battles are raging openly in the Lebanese society of Muslims in order to divide areas of influence and to establish control and leadership in this or that part of the country. In the personal sphere, this has manifested itself in the battle between Nabih Birri, the Amal leader, and Shaykh Fadlallah, the leader of the Hizballah grouping. One wants Lebanese society to be reconstructed on moderate lines, while the other defends the idea of an Islamic Revolution in Lebanon and is inclined toward setting up a government on the pattern of Iran.

It is also (?strange) that armed conflict between two major Shiite groupings has international aspects. For example the Amal Movement enjoys the support of Syria and looks to Damascus for its policy, while Hizballah receives political and military support from Iran. According to most assessments, Iran's maintenance of this organization costs more than $550 million. However, what makes the issue more complicated is that the interests of Iranian and Syrian foreign policy in Lebanon do not conform. Tehran seeks to create conditions conducive for spreading Islamic fundamentalism in southern Lebanon, while Syria has made it clear to Iran that it is not inclined to have a new Islamic Republic on its southern borders.

In brief, in southern Lebanon, a complicated situation has arisen from differences which defy resolving. However, it is clear in any case that this series of differences cannot be resolved by means of artillery and missile fire.

Chamber of Commerce Mission Opens in Tel Aviv

LD2607085590 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July TASS—A mission of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCI) officially opened in Tel Aviv, the CCI Information Board announced.

An agreement, signed in Moscow last January, on cooperation between the Soviet and Israeli Chambers of Commerce envisages the opening of their missiosn in both Tel Aviv and Moscow.

Delegation Arrives in Syria for Talks

PM2507133190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Kozhevnikov and TASS correspondent A. Subbotin: "Meetings at Syrian Parliament"]

[Text] Damascus, 21 Jul—A group of USSR People's Deputies headed by V.A. Tetenov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions, is currently visiting Damascus. A meeting was held at the People's Council—the Syrian parliament—within the framework of the broad contacts conducted by the Soviet representatives. During the friendly conversation with Council Speaker 'Abd al-Qadir Qaddurah there was a useful exchange of experience of the work of the two countries' supreme legislative organs. The guests from Moscow talked about the USSR Supreme Soviet's activity in conditions of perestroyka, the results of its recent session, and plans for the future. The interlocutors examined questions of deepening coordination, including at various international parliamentary forums, and prospects for the further improvement of traditional bilateral ties.

During a discussion of the situation in the Near East the sides advocated the adoption of urgent and effective measures to unblock the peace settlement process in the region. They stressed the importance of actively using interparliamentary contacts for those purposes. The Soviet and Syrian participants in the talks were united in the opinion that an international conference is the best means today for progress toward an all-embracing peace in the Near East which ensures human rights and the peoples' rights.

The Soviet deputies held a detailed and frank discussion with their counterparts from the Syrian People's Council. All the participants in the discussion showed great interest in the deepening of Soviet-Syrian relations and mutually beneficial cooperation in various spheres. The Syrians said that the historical friendship with the Soviet Union is highly valued in their country, where people believe in its sincerity as they also believe in the fact that the USSR will continue to firmly support the Arab peoples' just liberation struggle against Israeli occupation and for the realization of their national aspirations. People in Syria follow attentively Soviet representatives' statements on the Near East theme, which reflect the common views and approaches of the two countries to the problem of establishing a just peace in the region, the Syrian parliamentarians noted.

The question of Jewish emigration from the USSR occupied a special place in the conversation. The People's Council members' words expressed concern that resettlement is being carried out to the detriment of the Palestinian Arab people's legitimate rights. The Soviet guests explained the reasons for the emigration in the context of the democratic changes now taking place in our country. At the same time they mentioned that the USSR is making the most energetic efforts to ensure that the emigration does not harm friendly Soviet-Arab ties. The two sides agreed that closer cooperation on this question is needed.

Soviet, Syrian Foreign Ministers Meet

LD2607130290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Faruq al-Shar, Syrian minister of foreign affairs, met today with Tarasov, assistant to the USSR minister of foreign affairs and a special USSR representative for Middle East issues. The situation in the Middle East, matters of the Arab-Israeli settlement, and the perspectives of launching efforts for the convocation of an international peace conference were examined in detail.

Frolov Receives Omani Goodwill Delegation

PM2607124790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Meeting in Editorial Office"]

[Text] On 24 July this year I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, received a delegation from the Sultanate of Oman which is in Moscow on a goodwill mission. Present at the meeting were 'Abd-al-Hafiz Salim Rajab, head of the delegation, its other members, and Nizar ibn Muhammad 'Ali al-Shaykh, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Sultanate of Oman to the USSR. In the course of friendly talks I.T. Frolov briefed the guests in detail on the results of the work of the 28th CPSU Congress and on the profound revolutionary transformations under way in our country. Various aspects of international life were discussed.

Moroccan Envoy Corrects Press 'Inaccuracies'

PM2507125390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Letter from Rafiq al-Haddaoui, ambassador of the Kingdom of Morocco to the USSR, under the rubric "From the International Departments' Mailbag": "Ambassador's Corrections"]

[Text] I have the pleasure to inform you that we take great interest in your newspaper. In your issue 189 of 7 July 1990 we read with great interest an article about the Sahara signed by Yu. Kosinskiy. Two inaccuracies slipped through in that article, and I ask you to make corrections for your readers.

1. The article speaks of direct contacts between the Moroccan Government and Polisario [Popular Front for the Liberation of Saquia El Hamra and Rio de Oro], whereas there was no direct contact in Geneva and the UN secretary general received Morocco's representative and Polisario's representative consecutively.

I remind you that the Moroccan Government has always refused to hold direct talks with the Polisario Front for the simple reason that it believes that this movement does not represent the genuine Saharan population.

2. In the second paragraph of the article a badly informed reader might understand that the conflict between Morocco and POLISARIO has its roots in the 19th century, whereas from the 19th century the conflict was between Morocco and Spain, and Morocco first raised the question with the United Nations in the early sixties. Polisario, on the contrary, appeared on the international arena only in 1975 after the signing of the Madrid agreement between Morocco and Spain.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Mandela's 6-Week World-Wide Tour Viewed

90UF0370A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jul 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent I. Tarutin: "Terrorists"... But Maybe Partners?"]

[Text] Harare—After a six-week trip abroad Nelson Mandela, vice president of the African National Congress [ANC], returned to his native Republic of South Africa. He visited a number of countries of Africa, 12 countries of Western Europe, the United States, and Canada. The well-known leader of the South African liberation movement was received as a national hero not only in Maputo and Addis Ababa but also in Paris, London, and Washington.

But the emotional side of the meetings somewhat overshadowed the political aspect of his long and difficult foreign tour, during the course of which important negotiations took place. And the heads of the leading world powers received N. Mandela not as a private individual but in his official capacity as the leader of the ANC.

Up to this point Prime Minister of Great Britain Margaret Thatcher and many others have avoided contacts with leaders of the ANC. Therefore this was clearly a diplomatic breakthrough for the organization. In capitals which until quite recently were called terrorist, problems of regulating the conflict in South Africa cannot now be considered without the ANC. Thus it is actually recognized that the congress is playing a key role in the search for peace. Its platform and views on the current situation in the country and the future state structure have been taken into account in discussions at the highest level.

Nelson Mandela, speaking on behalf of the ANC, presented its main positions clearly. In his words, the process of elimination of apartheid has not yet reached the stage where it is possible to refrain from armed struggle and let up on international pressure on Pretoria by removing sanctions. At the same time, both in these questions and in others, while his approach as a whole was principled, he also displayed sufficient flexibility. Thus N. Mandela pointed out that he, like the South African government, is seriously concerned about the condition of the economy, whose development has been negatively affected by the international economic boycott, and he thinks that the boycott can be lifted even in the near future if certain agreements are reached with the regime.

Another example of the lack of dogmatism is the slogan about nationalization advanced by the ANC. At a meeting with representatives of business circles its leader explained that nationalization certainly does not necessarily have to be unconditional. They see in it only a means of changing the current unequal distribution of incomes between whites and blacks. But if other means become available for achieving this—foreign loans, credit, large capital investments—then variants are possible.

The Western media noted this desire on the part of the ANC to look for compromise. Nelson Mandela's trip destroyed previous stereotypes regarding this organization, and he himself not only ceased to be the inflexible warrior but also demonstrated the wisdom of a state leader and the refinement of a diplomat.

Not long before N. Mandela, practically the same route in Europe was traveled by the president of the Republic of South Africa, Frederik de Klerk. The press could not refrain from counting up the propaganda points each of them earned and clarifications of who outdid whom. There does not seem to be a need for that. Politics is not football. The idea of regulation in the Republic of South Africa so that nobody loses there demands partnership rather than confrontation. N. Mandela's visit clearly demonstrated to everyone that the ANC is ready to look for mutually acceptable solutions.

UN Relief Aid to Ethiopia Blocked, Famine Risked

LD2607132790 Moscow International Service in Swahili 1730 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] aid has been held up near Mitsiwa Port for a week, and the EPLF [Eritrean People's Liberation Front] has not allowed UN officials ashore. FAO says it has been forced to return its

delegation to its headquarters so the vessel carrying officials and relief aid, which is desparately needed to save four million lives in northern Ethiopia, has also left Mitsiwa. The FAO sent the vessel following the Ethiopian authorities' approval to use Mitsiwa Port. It is puzzling why the EPLF will not allow the FAO officials with food aid to use the port. This move is aimed at compelling the government to accept their terms for settling the conflict. A solution to the famine crisis must not be delayed because four million lives are at stake. According to the UN, 900,000 tonnes of food will be needed.

Soviet Trawler Seized by Somali Group

LD2607111990 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—A Soviet trawler with 27 crewmen on board was seized by an armed ship on July 18, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

The Soviet vessel was fishing in the Aden Gulf on a licence granted by the Somali Government to the Soviet-French company Fransov.

According to the spokesman, the attackers belong to the opposition Somali National Movement operating in the area.

The fishing vessel was anchored near Maydh island, 25 kilometers from the Somali coast. Some of the crew was taken ashore.

The spokesman said that the Soviet side had taken measures to establish contacts with the leaders of the Somali National Movement, as well as with the group that had seized the Soviet fishermen, to seek the immediate release of the ship and its crew.

East Europe

Statement on Ties by Albanian Official Examined

AU2607141490 Moscow International Service Albanian 1500 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Report on German Mitkevich commentary from "The World Today"]

[Text] The interview which Niko Gjyzari, general secretary of the Albanian Council of Ministers, gave to Soviet radio and television journalists was received with great interest in our country. His statement that the question of the reestablishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Albania is a matter of coming months and days attracted special attention.

The wall erected almost 30 years ago between our two states, the fault of the leaders at that time whose personal ambitions prevailed over common sense, is being demolished. The long absence of ties between our two countries could not but be to the detriment of the Albanian and Soviet peoples, our observer German Mitkevich writes.

As Niko Gjyzari rightly said in his interview, there were good relations between Albania and the Soviet Union in the past, and this was natural, our commentator continues, because the peoples of our countries defended together their freedom and independence against the fascist aggressors, and after their victory helped each other and worked with great self-sacrifice to create better living conditions. The Soviet Union, as a more developed country, even though it had suffered extensive war losses, helped Albania in the reconstruction and development of its economy, in the development of culture, science, education, and in other spheres of vital importance for Albania. It suffices to recall the construction of such pioneer projects of Albanian industry as the Tirana textile combine, the Cerrik oil-processing plant, and the hydroelectric plant on the River Mat.

Hundreds of Soviet tractors and other items of agricultural machinery worked in Albanian fields, while Soviet motor vehicles and trucks were an irreplaceable means of freight transportation within the country. Cooperation in the fields of culture, science, and education was also fruitful. Our country generously shared with Albania the experience it gained in such areas. Thousands of Albanian specialists were trained in Soviet educational institutions, and dozens of Soviet specialists worked in your country, passing on their own knowledge and experience to their Albanian colleagues. The first colleges, professional theaters, and the first Albanian films were created with their direct help and support.

What great steps forward Albanian science took in those years. It was no accident that the documents of the Fourth Albanian Workers Party [AWP] Congress in February 1961 stated that the help and support of the Soviet Union were among the most important external factors in Albania's colossal achievements in socialist construction.

Niko Gjyzari, in his interview granted to Soviet journalists, dwelt on the recent changes in Albanian foreign and domestic policy. The Soviets are following with great interest the incipient process of the democratization of Albanian life. The decisions of the recent plenums of the AWP Central Committee and the session of the Albanian People's Assembly held in May show the aim of the country's leaders to make Albanian policy match the changes evident in the world today. In the light of these changes, the issue of the fastest possible reestablishment of diplomatic relations between our countries is especially topical, because, as Niko Gjyzari said, we would wish Albanian-Soviet ties to be developed not only in the political sphere, but in trade, culture, sport, and other fields.

I am convinced, German Mitkevich writes in conclusion, that the Soviets fully share this desire, because friendly and equal cooperation on the basis of international norms accepted by all sides corresponds to the fundamental interests of both the Albanian and Soviet peoples.

Disagreements, Disorder Prevalent in Bulgaria

LD2607130390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Report by station correspondent in Bulgaria Viktor Samarin]

[Text] The leading factions in the Bulgarian multi-party parliament are holding consultations following the failure of two attempts to elect a president for the country. When, at repeat elections too, none of the three candidates for this post failed to gain the necessary majority of two thirds of the votes, it finally became clear that as long as the main political forces of the parliament fail to reach agreement among themselves in advance, perhaps resorting to mutual compromises, then the presidential seat in the Great People's Assembly will remain empty.

Commenting on this deadlock in parliament's work, today's newspapers—and of the most varied hue—agree with the conclusion that dragging out the election of a fully empowered head of state is intensifying tension in society and stimulating destructive tendencies, and the authority of the Great People's Assembly itself is declining among the people, as they see the almost ritual rivalry of the factions instead of their constructive cooperation.

All this is against the background of disorders which are acquiring an increasingly widespread and dangerous nature, including manifestations of anarchy and illegal actions. Just take for example the notorious City of Truth, as its organizers, groupings of particularly militant young extremists, have named their tent encampment in the center of Sofia. The square, which has literally been occupied by them—one cannot drive or walk across it—has essentially been transformed into a political center to incite the population to civilian disobedience, or to put it more simply, to lawlessness.

Incidentally, among the widespread and visible agitation which adorns this City of Truth—please put the last word in apostrophes—there are more than a few slogans, caricatures, even whole manifestos, whose nature is blatantly anti-Soviet and offensive to us. The person who is behind all this evidently thinks that it is easier this way to denigrate the very idea of democratic socialism and to discredit the new program of the Bulgarian Socialist Party.

Responding to the outraged protests of the capital's population, the government of Andrey Lukanov has finally adopted a decision on the elimination of this camp which is destabilizing the city's life. And although there have been attempts in parliament to revoke this executive decision, it is to the credit of the majority of deputies, including those from the opposition, that they have supported him.

So, the government now has an opportunity to restore order, using all the measures permitted by the constitution which is in force. Unfortunately, serious opposition figures have all the same not expressed their attitude toward the anti-Soviet bacchanalia of the organizers of the City of Truth, although they have stressed on more than one occasion that they regard Bulgarian-Soviet friendship as a historical cultural value which is not being revised, and an objective economic law. In particular, Petr Berdilyev, the leader of the Bulgarian Social Democratic Party, and one of the main candidates for the post of president, recently spoke personally to me about this.

Lithuanian Leader Seeks Open Border With Poland

AU2607123190 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 24 Jul 90 pp 1,2

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Agnieszka Magdziak-Miszewska and Jerzy Marek Nowakowski, place and date not given: "Solidarity Between Countries"]

[Text] [ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Representatives of the Poles, Lithuanians, and Byelorussians met at the Grunwald battlefield on 15 July. This was also the first meeting between a Polish and a Lithuanian head of state in history. How important was this meeting to you?

[Landsbergis] It possessed fundamental importance. It was a mutual recognition of the link between our fortunes in the past, present, and future. The Grunwald ceremony was attended by representatives of other nationalities, but those of Poland and Lithuania were conspicuous. To us, Grunwald is more than just a certain place in a certain country. This battlefield is the property of many nations. I regret the fact that no Germans attended, even though they were invited [the Germans were defeated in this battle in 1410]. Our delegation consisted not only of Lithuanians, but also Poles, Russians, and Tartars, the peoples of whom the Lithuanian forces in the battle were composed.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] You said the Grunwald meeting was a recognition of the link between our fortunes in the present as well. What do you mean?

[Landsbergis] Poland could have enormous importance for Lithuania because it is the only country with which we share a land border, and it is more difficult to make a land border impassible than a maritime border. A port can be successfully blockaded, but a land blockade can be easily overcome. Poland couid play a fundamental role in our bid for independence if its policy were more independent of other countries, but of course it is not. Even the policies of much stronger Western countries are

not like that. Please understand that I am not making accusations, just expressing regret.

We, on our part, are ready to open a new border crossing in Szypliszki at any time. We are also ready to open a new direct Polish-Lithuanian rail link. The Polish side makes such a project dependent on us reaching an agreement with Moscow. However, we would like Poland to be more active by making it clear to Moscow that such a rail link is very much desired. After all, from the angle of international law, this is not a Soviet border. If no one says so, it means they accept the presence of the Soviet Army there. We would like Poland to tell Moscow that it wants an open border with Lithuania. I understand of course that this is not easy, that you have won your sovereignty and already have something to lose. We are still free because we have nothing to lose.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] What is your stance toward the negotiations with Moscow that have been announced?

[Landsbergis] First, we must reach an agreement about the very meaning of the term "negotiations." Moscow has its own pattern, objectives, and schedule thereof, quite different from ours. Moscow is procrastinating in the hope that the talks will go on indefinitely and eventually end the way Moscow wants. Before our side takes part in the talks, we must have a guarantee of certain minimum conditions for them. We will not agree to negotiations in a climate of warnings, pressure, and threats. Those would not be negotiations at all, but merely diktat by one side, and begging for favorable terms by the other.

It ought to be made clear that it is not we who are leaving some place. On the contrary, we are waiting for the occupying forces to leave us. Postwar accounts, caused by a war that was too long, have yet to be settled. Unless this is done, there will never be a real end to World War II. One cannot build stabilization and a new order if the countries seized as a result of the Ribbentropp-Molotov Pact are still occupied. Lithuania is aiming toward stabilization.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Does Lithuania intend to join the CSCE?

[Landsbergis] We would like to, and are making an effort in this direction. If we are not admitted, this will be a disgrace for the entire CSCE process.

[ZYCIE WARSZAWY] Kohl met Gorbachev on the same day that you met President Jaruzelski. Was that a coincidence?

[Landsbergis] Certainly, but that coincidence can also be considered symbolic. Whenever the great men of this world meet, there are fears, stemming from the bitter experience of history, that they will conclude some secret agreement at our expense. That is why I advocate an essential alliance, if only an ideological one, between smaller countries who get along better with each other than they do with the great powers. I think there is a chance for such an alliance. I hope that when an alliance of the countries that are leaving totalitarian communism behind emerges, there will be no danger of conformity, with people considering what are the best countries with which to be linked.

Silayev Receives Serbian Official From Yugoslavia

PM2707100790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Cooperation]

[Text] On 26 July I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, received S. Radimilovic, chairman of the Serbian Socialist Republic (SFRY) Assembly Executive Council, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the Russian Government, and members of the Serbian delegation of which he is the head.

At the center of attention were questions of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation and the development of multifaceted Russian-Serbian relations. Specific problems of widening and improving mutually advantageous links between the RSFSR and the Serbian Socialist Republic were discussed.

West Europe

Italian Prime Minister Andreotti Concludes Visit

Talks Considered 'Fruitful'

LD2607182690 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti of Italy had a unique, in-depth, one-to-one talk in Moscow today to discuss global and bilateral issues.

The discussion was an extension of the two leaders' talks during Gorbachev's state visit to Italy last November. The talks were fruitful, comprehensive and friendly, according to Gorbachev and Andreotti.

Gorbachev told the Italian prime minister about perestroyka reforms. The transition to a market and the drafting of a new union accord, regulating relations between the Soviet republics, are number one priorities, Gorbachev said.

Italy and Western Europe realise the importance of perestroyka and are aware that its failure would be a catastrophe for everyone, Andreotti said.

The Soviet leadership has a clear-cut reform programme. This is extremely important and is crucial for Western help to the Soviet Union, he said.

Gorbachev and Andreotti discussed the results of the recent European summit in Dublin, the NATO meeting in London and the G-7 summit in Houston.

It is very important to ensure progress along directions charted at these meetings, including in cooperation between the Soviet Union and the West, they said.

Gorbachev and Andreotti talked in detail about developments in Europe, praising the character and dynamism of processes on the continent.

They expressed special satisfaction with the progress in relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty organisation.

Andreotti said he welcomes the fact that Gorbachev has been invited to speak at a session of the NATO Council.

The time is ripe for NATO reform itself. Member-countries of the two military alliances should expand political cooperation between each other, he said.

Gorbachev and Andreotti underscored the importance of the forthcoming 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Paris. They expressed hope that the summit will take meaningful steps on the way towards building new architecture in Europe.

The sides emphasised the importance of developing and deepening Soviet-Italian relations. Gorbachev noted that Italy always, even in troubled times, played a pioneer role in developing cooperation with the Soviet Union. "Today, too, although there are some problems, the dynamics of Soviet-Italian relations deserves the highest appraisal.

"The existing difficulties are largely linked with some legal issues of economic reform being unresolved. However, measures which are being carried out as part of preparations for the transition to market, including those pertaining to the terms for foreign investment, will create a qualitatively new and more favourable atmosphere for our cooperation," Gorbachev said.

Andreotti, in turn, noted that Italy attached great importance to the development of all-round ties with the Soviet Union. He emphasised that the agreements and understandings, reached during Gorbachev's visit to Italy in November 1989, served as a guiding post here. Andreotti said these agreements and understandings were a good platform for boosting cooperation.

Gorbachev and Andreotti were then joined for a discussion by other officials.

Gorbachev and Andreotti expressed deep satisfaction with the exchange of views held and agreed that contacts between them would be continued.

European Issues Discussed

PM2707100690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Andreotti"]

[Text] A working meeting took place on 26 July between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti. It was a wide-ranging, unusual, one-on-one discussion covering both the main problems of world and European development, and questions of the vigorously developing bilateral Soviet-Italian relations.

The two participants in the meeting described it as a continuation of the talks held last November during M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to Italy. In their opinion, the conversation was exceptionally fruitful, meaningful, and filled with confidence and friendliness.

At his interlocutor's request, M.S. Gorbachev described in detail the present complex and crucial stage of perestroyka. The transition to market relations and the formulation of a new Union Treaty are the key questions of today, like the two sides of a single coin.

G. Andreotti noted that the Italian leadership and Western Europe understand the importance of the success of perestroyka, whose failure would, in his words, be disastrous for everyone. The Italian head of government assessed highly the fact that the Soviet leadership, he is convinced, has not merely the intention, but a clear program for the realization of perestroyka reforms. That is very important, he said. It will help to strengthen the feelings in the West in favor of assisting the changes taking place in the Soviet Union.

The interlocutors discussed the results of the recent summit meetings of the European Community countries in Dublin, the NATO Council in London, and also the "Seven" in Houston. It was stressed that it is now important to ensure constructive progress along the avenues sketched out there. This applies first of all to cooperation between the Soviet Union and the West, which should be broad in nature, including collaboration in the political sphere.

The USSR president and the Italian prime minister devoted great attention to the development of the situation on the European continent. They assessed highly the nature and dynamics of the processes taking place here, stressing that despite the problems that exist, they should continue to develop in a positive direction.

Particular satisfaction was expressed in connection with the fact that movement has also begun in relations between the two military-political organizations of East and West. Welcoming the invitation issued to the USSR president to address the NATO Council, G. Andreotti noted that a profound transformation in that organization is overdue and that it is necessary to develop political cooperation between the countries belonging to the two military alliances.

The leaders of the USSR and Italy stressed the significance of the forthcoming summit meeting in Paris of the leaders of the 35 countries participating in the all-European process. They expressed the hope that this

meeting will be marked by substantial steps along the path of creating a new architecture in Europe.

Particular attention was devoted to the further development and deepening of Soviet-Italian relations. M.S. Gorbachev noted that even in times of "troubles" Italy has always played a pioneering role in the development of cooperation with the Soviet Union. Now too, although there are some problems, the dynamics of Soviet-Italian relations merit the highest assessment. The difficulties that exist are largely associated with the fact that a number of legal questions of the economic reform have yet to be resolved in the Soviet Union. However, the measures being adopted in the context of preparations for the transition to a market system, including those relating to the conditions for placing foreign investments, will create a fundamentally new, more favorable environment for our cooperation.

G. Andreotti, for his part, noted that Italy attaches great significance to the development of all-around ties with the Soviet Union. Guidance here is provided by the agreements and accords reached during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Italy last November. These agreements and accords, the head of government of the Italian Republic said, provide a good basis for the development of our future cooperation.

After the talk, a broader meeting took place, with the participation of the following: on the Soviet side—E.A. Shevardnadze, S.A. Sitaryan, K.F. Katushev, N.A. Pugin, V.V. Zagladin, A.A. Maslennikov, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, E.Ye. Obminskiy, and A.L. Adamishin; and on the Italian side—G. De Michelis, C. Vitalone, F. Salleo, B. Bottai, R. Vanni d'Archirafi, U. Vattani, G. Baldocci, and P. Mastrobuoni.

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Andreotti expressed deep satisfaction with the exchange of opinions that took place, and agreed that contacts between them will continue.

News Conference Held 26 Jul

LD2607214590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1740 GMT 26 Jul 90

[News conference by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti, in Moscow on 26 July—recorded; Andreotti speaks in Italian with Russian translation superimposed]

[Text] [video shows Gorbachev and Andreotti, with aides, including Maslennikov, seated facing audience of journalists] [Gorbachev] Good day to you, ladies and gentlemen. I want to say that today's visit by Italian Prime Minister Andreotti is confirmation of the constant and very substantive dialogue between us which is gaining ever increasing intensity and depth. In Mr. Andreotti, and I can now say this with great conviction, we, the Soviet side, and I personally, have a fine, wise, and profound partner, disposed toward endeavor, and a person capable in any situation of pursuing a dialogue that enriches world politics.

We have had very thorough talks indeed regarding European policy, where fundamental changes are taking place now and, I would say, where the center of world policy has moved to. This means we have spoken about the European home in changing conditions; so we have spoken both about perestroyka and the events in Eastern Europe, and about the whole range of problems linked with German unification.

I am very satisfied with the talks. Today, as before, I can speak about the great potential of Soviet-Italian cooperation which retained its dynamics and meaningfulness even in difficult times. Now this helps us to discuss all the problems of today's changing world openly, in the atmosphere which is already characteristic for our relations, an atmosphere of confidence and friendliness.

You know, it so happened that both I and Mr. Andreotti had the idea of meeting at a certain moment, and we quickly agreed to meet. If you consider that just before the meeting many important events have occurred, [you will see that] we were able to touch upon them and draw conclusions about where we all are together now.

I suggested to Mr. Angreotti that this working visit is no substitute for the official visit that he is to pay at our invitation, and we agreed that this would take place in the autumn. But there will be other meetings too, as is now clear. It's going to be an eventful autumn, and we have much work to do.

Finally, we looked into the major aspects for our bilateral cooperation at a concrete level. In the meantime, conversations were going on between the foreign ministers and other representatives of the Soviet and Italian Governments. There was a very substantive exchange of views, and not only an exchange of views, but also a discussion of many specific issues. Over to you, Mr. Andreotti.

[Andreotti] I would like to thank Mr. Gorbachev for his cordial remarks about me, and I fully subscribe to his view that the meeting we were able to hold today was valuable. We were able to establish that in the seven-and-a-half months since the president's visit to Italy—a visit of tremendous importance that was noted for being extremely rich in substance—things have developed in the very direction we foresaw at that time.

In particular, we were able to exchange comment on three recent events—the European Council in Dublin, the NATO Council in Brussels, and the meeting of the seven industrially developed countries in Houston. Pivotal to those three meetings was a discussion of the problems connected with the profound transformation of life in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, and also of how all of us together can help build a better future through united effort.

President Gorbachev gave me an analytical picture of what could be termed the supports—the basic ideas of both the economic and the institutional reform in this country. All this will enable a rapid and in-depth analysis

of the elements that the European Community instructs the EEC Commission to study. Following the Delors visit and the contacts to take place in the days to come, we hope it will be possible to draw up conclusions to submit at the European Council meeting on 27 October. The following points are exceptionally important for the European equilibrium and its preservation: strengthening cooperation with the context of the European Community, and updating NATO, regarding military strategy in today's so different world, regarding increasing the attention given ton non-military spheres of activity, and regarding the increased significance of the new policy of cooperation in all-European affairs.

I have in mind, first and foremost, the Helsinki-2 meeting, which will take place in Paris at the end of this year.

As far as enhancing the role of this initiative, that is, the summit conference on the all-European process, is concerned, it is very important that President Gorbachev confirmed that the Soviet Union not only does not seek to drive a wedge between the Europeans and the Americans, but considers the United States an element of stability, which ought to play a full part in the European process. For elderly people like ourselves, who have spent their lives working in this direction, such words are music to our ears.

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, we and the foreign ministers agreed to give mighty impetus to the implementation of those projects outlined during President Gorbachev's visit to Italy. Respectable progress among themselves that they would instruct officials to work on all these questions during August, and that in September Ministers Shevardnadze and De Michelis would meet here, not only to draw some conclusions, but also to issue priority instructions for the implementation of specific projects.

Finally, I would like to repeat that we regard the success of perestroyka not just as something which corresponds to the vital interest of Soviet society, but also as meeting the esential interests of Europe and the maintenance of world balance. Therefore, we must not simply confine ourselves to well-meaning words and wishes, but seek forms of concrete support. Minister De Michelis and I will be putting forward specific proposals to our Council of Ministers with a view to taking concrete steps. Thank you.

[Italian correspondent in Italian, with superimposed Russian translation] I have a question for President Gorbachev. What do you expect from Italy over the coming months, as a contribution to the cause of perestroyka?

[Gorbachev] Well, first and foremost, we expect from the Italian people and their government that they will continue their profound understanding, sympathy, and solidarity with our immense cause, which we have called perestroyka. We hope that the talks which were held in November last year and today's talks will facilitate the solution of a number of practical problems connected with conversion, with the mastering of new technologies, and especially with modernization aimed at increasing output of consumer goods. Finally, now that we are actually facing profound changes, this will naturally affect the entire economy. It will affect all enterprises one way or the other. I don't think this will be a simple process. In a number of cases it could even be painful.

We are naturally counting above all on our own possibilities, and indeed it is difficult to set tasks and to reform one's country—and such a big one at that—by expecting that all these changes will come just from foreign sponsors of some kind. No, that would be serious. So we shall be bringing into play the potential means of our own society through new mechanisms and incentives. That is the first thing. But we shall also require certain financial resources to give us an opportunity for manouver, in order to blunt the acuteness of problems and to ensure that perestroyka is not held up. For if we had to avoid painful phenomena, we would then naturally opt for an extension of this period and for keeping state regulation to a greater degree. On the other hand, if we have some means for eliminating this acuteness, the pace of reform will proceed as dynamically as we hope. This is what we discussed, and we can sense a positive attitude on the part of the government, and I must say, of Italian business people too.

[Andreotti] As President Gorbachev has already reminded us today, we are not starting from scratch in this sphere. Many things are already being implemented. We disussed and worked up here a dual idea: of importing greater smoothness to the operation of a series of projects among those signed during the president's visit to Italy, and of giving them financial backing. A request was made about granting credit, which will go, in part, toward effecting payments on which there is a delay at the moment.

[Unidentified journalist] A question for the USSR president. During your discussion of German unification, what similarities were there in your positions, and what differences or disparities, if any?

[Gorbachev] First of all, the prime minister and I lauded each other when we got to this problem. Why? We had discussed this problem very thoroughly last November, and in some measure we had been forecasting developments, and it must be said that our forecast has proved 80-90 percent accurate. Since that was the case, we lauded each other because this had enabled us to foresee the course of events and their rapidly-moving nature, and thus to bring into play the necessary mechanisms of political influence and cooperation at this very crucial phase of changes connected with the unification of Germany. As you can see, for all the acuteness of this process, it has in fact been channelled.

It is connected with every aspect of European politics and with the all-European process, and all Europeans are now actively involved in examining the whole complex

of problems engendered by that process. I would say that there were no differences of any great substance between us. We exchanged views on various aspects of the problem, and this merely enriched our discussion, and on the whole we discussed the issue in a spirit of mutual understanding.

[Unidentified journalist] A question for the president. If this aid from Western Europe—which apparently cannot arrive before the end of this year—begins to arrive, when would you expect positive results, a positive influence from this aid on the course of perestroyka?

[Gorbachev] I still see the main positive results as depending on how the changes toward entering into market processes proceed in our country. According to our estimates—and we still have a Supreme Soviet session to come, at which the issue will be very thoroughly scrutinized and the government's revamped proposals on this will be examined... nevertheless our hope is that thorough work over the next two years will suffice for us to be able to introduce powerful market mechanisms.

For the moment, I'm saying nothing of the fact that for this we have a very great deal to do in these remaining months in order to enter into this process from January. Here, I think, a very great deal will depend on the state of our market and the functioning of enterprises manufacturing goods for the market above all. In these circumstances the financial aid we are counting on will allow us on the one hand to exploit our capacities by bringing in some raw materials, so that there is no constriciton of consumer goods production because of disruptions to imports, and on the other hand we shall act so that during this period, by unleashing economic initiative and creating an environment for enterprise, we can organize cooperation between the relevant Western firms and our own firms that are supplying the market.

If this is the case, these financial opportunities will in fact be as appropriate and timely as they could possibly be. Therefore, if we are talking about the light and food industries, this return could be seen there as early as the coming year. But subsequently we will have to build up this process and proceed to a more developed market. So, this is when we will need this assistance, during these two years when we will—which will be particularly difficult and particularly crucial, I would say. But, of course, it is already needed as we approach the current year.

Clearly, this is not a handout. We will have to return all this. Our people wouldn't accept any other conditions. It would be an insult to them. Besides, we are not the sort of country which could not sustain some 20 or 40 billions [in debt], given that there are countries dozens of times smaller which do sustain 20, 30, and 40 billions. No. It's just that time demands such a manouver.

We agreed that a number of documents, legal acts, should be brought into force as quickly as possible. Some will be adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Others will be issued as presidential decrees, and others as government decisions. This will be done so that we can create the legal basis for the switch to the market as quickly as possible. The first acts to go through will be as follows: one on the development of economic independence and entrepreneurship, one on the investment of foreign capital—on the creation of new, more favorable conditions for Western partners. There will be a decree on banking activities and improving and amending the credit and finance system. There will be a decree on a committee to be in charge of dismantling state control and the creation of share-holding. There will be a decree—or a government decision—on the machinery for implementing the law on land reform.

In other words, we want to adopt all these acts as a matter of priority and, thereby, to create incentives for enterprise, economic activity and initiative—both within the country, first and foremost, of course, for the working people—but also for those who will be cooperating with us during that time in developing cooperation.

[Maslennikov] The correspondent for the Japanese TV company NHK, [name indistinct].

[Correspondent, in Russian] I represent the Japanese TV company NHK. (?Mr. State) president, what event had the strongest influence on your decision to recognize united Germany's membership in NATO?

[Gorbachev] I would not relate this to a single event. I am convinced, for instance, that had it not been for the London... [corrects self] Dublin Declaration about the change, the transformation of this organization—NATO, I mean—it would have been very difficult for us to formulate our proposals. But I should also say here that from our partners—I have in mind the two- plus-four, and above all the FRG and GDR, and our other participants and partners in Europe—we also sensed a desire to really get down to realistic politics. I have in mind above all the fact that this matter, the problem of the unification of Germany, was linked with the European process and the Vienna talks. Thus a whole nexus of events influenced our position. But you may have noticed that it has remained fundamentally the same. We had said that the situation was that whether we wanted it or not, a united Germany was destined, at the first stage, at some transitional stage, prior to the consolidation of the European process, the strengthening of European security structures, and the transformation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, to be held by two anchors. So these two anchors are there. When we met at a news conference here, the formula we used—that a united Germany should be simultaneously linked to NATO and the Warsaw Pact—perhaps seemed strange to you. But as you can see, that is the way it is.

So our position has been transformed toward seeking and approaching [our partners], and we have seen reciprocal movement from the other side, and this led to this synthesized position which, it seems to me, satisfies and meets the interests of all countries, both the Europeans

and the entire world community, inasmuch as this is a very important aspect of world politics. We are saying that history has decreed that a united Germany should emerge today. There will be a final document, the rights and responsibilities of the Four Powers will be brought to an end, and a united Germany will emerge as a completely sovereign state. And it is a united sovereign Germany—not the GDR and FRG, as today—that will decide which alliance to belong to. We took note of Herr Kohl's statement that he, as chancellor of the FRG, advocates that a united Germany should be part of NATO; but this will be decided by the government of united Germany.

[Maslennikov] We must end. A last question.

[Unidentified journalist] Mr. President, you have spoken of the future architecture of Europe. What, specifically, have you agreed on with Signor Andreotti?

[Gorbachev] Specifically, we said that Italy and the Soviet Union, possessing unique experience of cooperation, and their great adherence to the building of a new Europe, will continue to interact in all areas so that this policy may assume definite forms. I could list many things for you on this subject. We spoke about economic, legal, and ecological space. We spoke of the emergence of a new system of security. We spoke of the transformation of the military-political alliances. We said that today powerful integrational processes have already gotten under way on our continent, that we must stimulate them further, and that they must embrace the whole continent. We also said that as Europeans—and the prime minister has already mentioned this—we welcome the constructive cooperation, and the contribution to building the new Europe, of the United States and Canada.

[Andreotti] I'd like to add, for my part, that if we all consider that the success of perestroyka is in the interests, not only of the Soviet Union, or of some of the European states, but also in the interests of the whole continent and of the whole of international development, then we must make every possible effort to remove the obstacles—which for some are perhaps purely psychological—so that each may make his contribution to this great enterprise. I want to say that we have already come so far, on the most serious issues, that I shall not be unduly optimistic if I say that other issues will also prove amenable to solution. [words of thanks and goodbyes are heard]

Andreotti Leaves Moscow

LD2607142390 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti of Italy flew home from Moscow today after a brief working visit to the Soviet Union.

At the airport, he was seen off by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and other officials.

During his talks with Soviet leaders, Andreotti discussed bilateral relations, relations between the Soviet Union and the European communities, German unification and European security.

New Soviet-Italian Magazine To Be Published

LD2707082590 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 27 Jul 80

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—A new monthly will be published by the Rizzoli-COPRRIERE DELLA SERA concern for from Milan and the Soviet copyright agency (VAAP)

The ANNA magazine will focus on fashion, recipes, horoscopes and sentimental stories. It will run to approximately 100 pages and is published in Russian.

"Ties with our Italian colleagues are successfully developing. VAAP representative Vladimir Blelenkov told a news conference here on Thursday. "The work to launch the joint venture is drawing to a close." "The venture will publish several magazines in Russian—literary, publicistic, sports and ecological. The venture plans to make videofilms and sell them in the Soviet Union and abroad."

Belenkov said the agency has signed a protocol on cooperation with the Italian Fata firm to hold exhibitions in Italy, familiarizing Italians with Soviet cultural values. He said the export and import of copyrights on works by Soviet and Italian writers and art workers has considerably grown over recent years. Book exhibition exchanges have increased and an Italian music festival in Leningrad in planned to be held this spring.

Italy's Central Committee Ends Two-Day Plenum

PM2607134390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Debate on Party's Fate"]

[Text] Rome, 25 Jul—The second, concluding day's work of the PCI [Italian Communist Party] Central Committee plenum took place in Rome in an atmosphere of acute polemics over the "constituent process" with regard to creating a new political organization of left-wing forces in the country.

The chief event of the second day was undoubtedly the speech by Pietro Ingrao, leader of the party "minority" which is extremely critical of the idea of replacing the communist party with a new political formation. "Time is pressing on us all," he said. "We are talking of the fate of the party which for the past 40 years was considered the largest opposition force in the country. To renew it, transform it, revive it—I am in favor of this."

After the end of the debate on the report by PCI Secretary General Achille Occhetto "Analysis of the Political Situation and the Course of the Constituent

Process with Regard to Creating a New Political Organization of Left-Wing Forces in the Country," the leader of the communist party once again took the floor. He pointed out that the plenum had revealed different viewpoints. At the same time the debate had taken place, on the whole, in a constructive tone and been characterized by a desire to proceed from sharp polemics to a calmer comparison of views.

The plenum resolution points out that conferences on questions of the party's program and its organizational structure will be held in October this year. The next PCI Central Committee plenum is to be convened right after that to determine the date for holding the 20th congress, which is to take place not later than the middle of January 1991.

A decision was also adopted at the plenum to appoint Renzo Foa chief editor of the newspaper L'UNITA.

Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Swedish Premier

LD2607214190 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov]

[Text] Stockholm July 27 TASS—Visiting Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy met sitting Prime Minister Odd Engstrom of Sweden here on Thursday.

The two discussed preparations for forthcoming international conferences, including the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly, the European process, international scientific and technical cooperation, the situation in northern Europe and Soviet-Swedish relations.

They praised the importance of a forthcoming international environmental conference on the Baltic Sea in Sweden, hoping that it will be a success.

Later in the day Petrovskiy met deputies of the Northern Council Secretary-General G. Sjornberg and K. Mattson.

The sides discussed cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Northern Council. The talks were also attended by Soviet Ambassador to Sweden N. Uspenskiy.

Soviet Ambassador Takes Up Post in Sweden

PM2607144590 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 25 Jul 90 p 5

[TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA report: "The Soviet Union's New Man Is Here"]

[Text] Nikolay Uspenskiy, the Soviet Union's new ambassador to Sweden, yesterday formally took up his post after presenting his credentials to King Carl XVI Gustaf.

Uspenskiy, who was born in 1946, graduated from the Institute of International Relations in Moscow in 1969. Since then he has been employed at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

On his diplomatic postings abroad he has served in London and Canada.

He succeeds Boris Pankin, who has been transferred to Czechoslovakia.

Swedish Cabinet To Rule on Hijacking Extradition

LD2607184890 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov]

[Text] Stockholm July 26 TASS—Nothing prevents Sweden from extraditing Anatoliy Mikhailenko, 19, who hijacked an Aeroflot plane to Sweden late in June, to Soviet authorities, the country's Supreme Court told the government today.

The Swedish cabinet will take the final decision on the issue at an emergency meeting, probably early next week, according to sitting Justice Minister Bengt Lindquist.

The Supreme Court at a meeting Wednesday said that Sweden was guided by its international commitments to fight air piracy. Neither Mikhailenko's age, nor any other consideration can alleviate the graveness of his crime, it said.

The Supreme Court agreed with Sweden's prosecutor general that Mikhailenko's unwillingness to serve in the Soviet Armed Forces, which the hijacker said prompted him to commandeer the plane, cannot serve as a reason to refuse his extradition.

Soviet authorities will prosecute Mikhailenko only for the hijacking and not for violating the border, the court said.

Sweden put similar conditions to the Soviet side when it extradited Dmitriy Semenov, 17, last week. Semenov was the first to hijack a Soviet plane to Sweden this summer.

On Wednesday, Senior Prosecutor Solveig Riberdahl reported to the prosecutor general about Mikhail Mokretsov, 18, who hijacked a Soviet domestic flight from Leningrad to Lvov early this month.

Nothing prevents Sweden from extraditing Mokretsov to Soviet authorities, her report said.

Greek Frigate Concludes Visit to Sevastopol

PM2607132390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jul 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent M. Stetsyuk: "Limnos Visit Ends"]

[Text] Sevastopol, 21 Jul—The official friendly visit to the USSR by the Greek frigate Limnos under the personal flag of Fleet Commander Rear Admiral N. Vasiliou ended today.

During the visit the Greek sailors visited the patrol escort ship Bezukoriznennyy and familiarized themselves with the life of Black Sea sailors. The guests visited Sevastopol's memorials and the Crimea's south shore, and met residents of the hero-city.

"They were unforgettable meetings," Rear Adm. N. Vasiliou said. "I am sure that the contacts between the two countries' sailors will serve the cause of strengthening peace and mutual understanding between our two peoples."

Consultations on Near East Staged in Ireland

LD2607095390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Dublin: Soviet-Irish consultations have been held in the Irish capital. A broad range of questions concerning the situation in the Near East was discussed. Expressing concern at the dangerous development of the situation in this region, the sides called for greater efforts to assist the peace process and to speedily achieve an all-embracing settlement between the Arabs and Israel. Taking part in the consultations were Murphy, deputy foreign minister; Polyakov, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry; and also Uranov, USSR ambassador to Ireland.

Bank of England: No Record of Ukraine Gold

LD2607135390 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] London July 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Natalya Kirsanova:

The Bank of England is confident that it will not have to pay the Ukraine 16 trillion pounds sterling in compensation for gold that was allegedly deposited at the bank by a prominent Ukrainian nationalist at the beginning of the 18th century, John Footman, official spokesman for the bank, told TASS.

The matter concerns a barrel of gold which, according to some members of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet, was lodged with the Bank of England by Pavel Polubotok, hetman of the Left Bank Ukraine, in 1723 before he set out for St. Petersburg for talks with Peter the Great. Once in the capital, Polubotok was thrown into the St. Peter and Paul Fortress and died there

The hetman is believed to have willed the barrel of gold to a sovereign and independent Ukraine.

The compensation issue arose recently due to the declaration of state sovereignty by the Ukraine parliament.

The Bank of England learned about the gold from press and television reports. Although no official request has been submitted, the bank management ordered a search of the archives over the respective period to establish the truth, Footman said.

A Ukrainian member of parliament estimated the sum in question to be 16 trillion pounds sterling, six times the amount of the United States' gross domestic product. The parliamentarian also said that if the gold from the barrel were divided between the people of the republic, each would get 300,000 pounds.

But no mention either of Polubotok or of the receipt for the Ukraine gold has been found in the Bank of England archives, which extend back to its founding in 1694, Footman said.

Nevertheless, he said, the bank is prepared to study any documents that the Ukraine may submit to clarify this mysterious story.

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. Involvement in Cubans' Asylum Bid Reported

Actions 'Planned' by U.S.

PM2607120590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS "News in Brief" report]

[Text] Cuba, 20 Jul—Five Cubans who had taken refuge in the residence of the charge d'affaires of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic [CSFR] in Cuba have voluntarily left the building and given themselves up to the authorities. They made this decision following a meeting with representatives of the Cuban Foreign Ministry in the presence of a Czechoslovak diplomat. Cuban television broadcast an interview with certain individuals, members of the dissident organization "Association for Free Art," who were the first to enter the CSFR embassy premises. They claimed that the action was planned and proposed to them by personnel of the U.S. interests department, which operates at the Swiss Embassy in Cuba, and of the FRG Embassy and by the CSFR charge d'affaires. According to them, the purpose of the action was to "provoke a serious conflict between Cuba and the CSFR" that might lead "to unforeseen consequences in the international arena." Some other Cuban dissidents from the so-called "Cuban Committee for Human Rights" were also invited to the conversation with journalists. They confirmed that the operation was planned by the U.S. interests department and by the FRG Embassy back in March.

U.S. Section Denies Charges

PM2607130390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 p 3

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Novikov: "Diplomats' 'Reception' Season"]

[Text] Havana—For some days now many diplomatic missions in Havana have looked highly unusual: All approaches to them have been blocked. There are armed police stationed at five-meter intervals. It is not difficult to figure out the reason: The unpleasant incident at the Czechoslovak Embassy, where a couple of dozen Cuban citizens spent several days in hiding, turned out to be a precedent and sparked off a number of similar incidents. "Refugees" also invaded the Spanish and Italian Embassies and, according to unconfirmed information, some other diplomatic missions. However, first things first.

Three days after the five Cubans left the residence of the charge d'affaires of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic [CSFR], local television showed a "special program" on the story. Three "counterrevolutionaries" who had participated in the "capture" of the embassy, and another two who are currently under investigation appeared in it. They all belong to dissident circles, are members of illegal rights-protection organizations, and have convictions for "hostile propaganda," for "undermining state security," and so on. According to these people, the events in the CSFR Embassy were (as Fidel Castro had put it the day before) a carefully planned provocation, and the U.S. Interests Section in Cuba at the FRG Embassy and CSFR Embassy Charge d'Affaires Jan Domok personally were behind it. One of the speakers, whose "record" was top-heavy with various antigovernment actions, denied the rumors that are rife here about certain "refugees" being Cuban security service personnel or agents whose task was to get into the Czechoslovak mission, reconnoiter it, and smoke out the dissidents. This person also said that the purpose of the "provocation" in which he participated was to "attack the government" and "provoke an internal and international conflict."

On the very next day the U.S. Interests Section in Cuba put out a statement categorically denying all the charges against it, calling them "total and utter fabrications" and "yet another attempt to discredit peaceful activities in the sphere of human rights in Cuba and create a false idea of interference and manipulation on the part of the United States." In the same document the Americans announced, not without some sarcasm, that "among the thousands of Cubans visiting the U.S. Interests Section every month there are plenty of people whom we suspect, not without reason, of being provocateurs and agents and who try to involve department personnel in provocative conversations."

This rather sharp exchange between the Cuban and U.S. sides is, however, quite a common phenomenon in the two neighboring states' political life. The sudden extremely acrimonious conflict that has flared up between the Cuban and Spanish Governments is much more unexpected.

It is not hard to figure out that it was caused by intrusion into Spanish Embassy premises by Cubans whom foreign journalists call "refugees" and local journalists call "antisocial elements" and who even included a family with two children. In this case the flareup is serious. One Cuban got into the embassy through a window and another launched himself from a passing bus, jumping over the fence and damaging his leg. Several shots were heard in the vicinity of the mission—the police fired into the air in order to prevent more "guests" from getting in. In response to his protest in this connection, the Spanish ambassador was told that the guard had been "overzealous" in resorting to this method. However, despite all the efforts by the police, the number of "refugees" continued to grow, reaching 18 by Monday 23 July (one should say, in passing, that there are four Cubans in the Italian embassy at present).

It is interesting also that there are very significant differences between the Cuban and Spanish interpretations of the events. The Spanish claim that the Cuban police not only fired, but also entered the embassy premises. However, there is no mention of this in the Cuban press (and it is practically the sole source of official information in Cuba). Therefore it was somewhat of a surprise to accredited journalists to see the Spanish bring in the "heavy artillery." What do they mean by this?

Francisco Fernandez Ordonez, representing Spain, addressed the Brussels conference of EEC foreign ministers and "reminded the Cuban Government of two things": 1. One should not intrude in foreign embassies, it "is a basic mark of good manners and civilized behavior." 2. Citizens have the right to leave the country. "One cannot create a system that denies to those who want to leave the fundamental right to leave." "What is happening is regrettable," F. Ordonez said. "Particularly as it is taking place in countries that are renowned for their harsh disregard for human rights." Asked by a journalist whether the situation that has come about would affect relations between Spain and Cuba, the foreign minister replied: "Unless the Cuban Government helps to resolve it in accordance with basic standards in the sphere of human rights and the traditions of civilized countries... it will have an effect, without any doubt.... It is very sad, because we greatly value and love the Cuban people and it is a pity that Cuba is not joining the widespread movement toward democracy that is currently taking place throughout Latin America." "At the present time," F. Ordonez stressed, "there is great unease in Havana as a result of Cuba's isolation and the very serious economic situation. However, this disastrous situation is of benefit to no one, whereas everyone would benefit from a peaceful transition to democracy...." "It is also clear to Spain that the government headed by Fidel Castro has violated foreign embassies' territorial inviolability, as envisaged by the United Nations," and this "is bound to cloud relations between the two countries."

One subsequent event was the publication in the paper GRANMA of a statement by the Cuban Foreign Ministry which made disparaging remarks about F. Ordonez' pronouncements. In particular, it suggested that "Mr. Ordonez is clearly suffering from historical amnesia."

since "his opinions, homilies, and regrets remind one of the edicts of the captains general who governed Cuba for the Spanish kings." "To the ignorance he has shown regarding the situation in Cuba," the statement stresses, "Mr. Ordonez has added the fact that he is scandalously ill-informed when it comes to international law...."

It only remains to add that since the aforementioned document was brought to the attention of Spanish representatives, the latter have announced economic sanctions against Cuba and have also urged all the members of the EEC to follow their example.

Cooperation Prospects With Cuba Examined

LD2607132190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] On 26 July the Cubans are celebrating the anniversary of the 1953 revolution. [passage omitted] Our guest today is Yuriy Pavlov, chief of the Latin American Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Here is how he assesses the level of Soviet-Cuban cooperation. [passage omitted]

Changes taking place in the Soviet Union have given rise to controversial reactions in Cuba. How does this affect the development of bilateral ties?

[Pavlov in Russian with superimposed English translation] I think it would be wrong to believe that the processes occurring in the USSR and measures designed to restructure our political and economic system are misunderstood in Cuba. During Mikhail Gorbachev's visit there, Fidel Castro pointed out unambiguously that the Cubans wished success to the perestroyka. The future of our cooperation depends to a great extent on such success. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] Considering difficulties experienced by the Soviet Union today, how do you assess the prospects of economic cooperation between the two countries?

[Pavlov] If we assess the prospects of our cooperation with Cuba in terms of quality, not quantity, they can be described as good. [passage omitted]

Cuban Ambassador Delivers National Day Address

LD2607190790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Studio talk by Jose Ramon Balaguer Cabrera, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Republic of Cuba to the USSR, on the occasion of Cuba's national uprising day; from the "Vremya" newscast—Cabrera's remarks in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] Dear Soviet friends: The history of Cuba is full of fighting and battles for complete independence and human dignity, to which every people has a right. One of those battles took place on 26 July 1953, when a group of insurgents led by Fidel Castro, just like Antonia Maceo in 1878 in Baragua, rose to defend the memory of Jose Marti that had been vilified by tyranny. Our people profoundly honors those who fell on that day and today pays tribute to their memory, demonstrating everything that has been done by their brothers in the name of revolution and socialism.

Today our people are discussing, criticizing, analyzing, and putting forward ideas an proposals on the problems to be considered at the fourth congress of the Cuban communist party in the aim of perfecting our society and correcting past shortcomings and mistakes to consolidate and identify everything that is best, what is necessary and what our people wants.

Our unity is based on our ideology which is oriented entirely toward the human being. Cuba not only respects human rights, we have a cult of human dignity. In our society the prosperity and happiness of children, the elderly, the sick, mothers, men and women, and their development as individuals are given constant attention by the party and the government, the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, students, and academics.

Facing up to all difficulties in cohesion we are full of optimism and faith in the future. Today, finding ourselves in this fraternal country so beloved of our people, we confirm our commitment to the cause of socialism, our strong friendship and love of Lenin's native land which, we are certain, will be victorious in its endeavors to make life better.

Cuban Army Political Workers' Visit Reported

PM2607083590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Cuban Political Workers' Visit"]

[Text] A delegation of Cuban political workers headed by Colonel A. Alvarino Atienzar, chief of the Ideological Work Directorate and deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Cuban Rolutionary Armed Forces [FAR], was in the Soviet Union 15-22 July.

The delegation was received by Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Meetings were also held with Colonel General G.A. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

During the conversations at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, which were held in a warm, friendly atmosphere, the Cuban guests were briefed on the experience of ideological work organizations in the Soviet Armed Forces, and described the tasks being tackled by FAR political workers at this stage. The delegation paid a visit to the V.I. Lenin Military-Political Academy.

The Cuban political workers visited the Carpathian Military District.

28th CPSU Congress

CPSU Thanks Foreign Well-Wishers to Congress

PM2707085790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee message of thanks to foreign senders of greetings to 28th CPSU Congress: "Gratitude for Greetings"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee expresses profound gratitude to the foreign parties and organizations, statesmen, and public figures who sent greetings to the 28th CPSU Congress.

We regard the sincere wishes expressed in them for the success of Soviet perestroyka, the understanding of the difficulties and tasks facing us, and the profound interest in overcoming them via the renewal of our party and country as substantial support for the CPSU's policy of advancing toward humane, democratic socialism and mankind's peaceful development.

Our friends may rest assured that the CPSU will continue to develop a fruitful dialogue and actions of solidarity with communist, socialist, social democratic, labor, national democratic, ecological, and liberal parties and other political trends in the interests of the demilitarization and democratization of international relations and the building of lasting structures of world security, social justice, and progress.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee.

Ulyanov Speech on 'Renewed Socialism' Published

90UN2393A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 28, 14 Jul 90 p 3

[Speech by M. Ulyanov published under the rubric "Congress of Communists: Drama of the Day": "The Speech That Was Not Permitted to Take Place. Mikhail Ulyanov: The Reason for Failures"]

[Text] At the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party almost every speaker declared that the Russian Communist Party will be a party of the Leninist type and of socialist choice. Others have said that it will be a party of renewed socialism. No one argued with this either. But questions arise. What is renewed socialism? That is to say that we had socialism, but is it necessary to renew it? And what kind of socialism did we have? When you look backward, you think agonizingly, "What is the reason for our failure?" It is a splendid idea and a noble dream—to make everyone happy and everyone equal. And how much blood was spilled in the name of implementing this idea. And how many bright intellects have been sacrificed. And in life everything seemed to happen in the opposite way: Most are not equal and most are not happy. Why? And perhaps we should not renew a socialism which has not brought us successes. Much time has been allowed for the implementation of what was promised—72 years!

Perhaps we should not renew a socialism of inflexible dogmatism, a socialism of cheerless unwarranted leveling, a socialism of the poor, a socialism of speechless pawns, a socialism of incontestable leaders and silent masses, a socialism of the destruction of the peasantry, its provider, and a socialism of those who have been beaten into a solid herd of people made equal in poverty and universal dependence and who are prepared as a result of boredom and hopelessness to crush anyone who does not resemble them and is able to think differently from everyone else. Someone who does not conform to the norm that they themselves created in their own image and likeness. A socialism which was at one time turned from the true path and began to serve not the people but the leaders and naked ideology.

That turning point dates back a long time. But those norms, which have become customary, are putting out luxurious blossoms today as well. Remember the stamping and cries of the majority directed at Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov at the First Congress of People's Deputies. Recall how the majority was prepared to trample underfoot that stubborn and absolutely incomprehensible man who was irritating the majority.

The sources of that murderous aggression gathered force in the threshing machine of Stalin's collectivization, in the hopelessness of the gulags, and in the general physical extermination of people.

The system of such socialism knocked the slightest manifestation of spirituality out of the people. The whole policy of destroying people and spirituality was violent and merciless. Even wild, steppe tribes who burst upon rich Byzantium in ancient times were more charitable. These sullen people from the steppe did not destroy the famous temples of Byzantium, and they only copied the Byzantine gods for their own. And the great creation of the Byzantine masters—the Saint Sophia—still stands in Istanbul today. But here where the Church of Christ the Savior once stood there is a hole filled with water. And around mother Russia there are hundreds upon hundreds of defaced and destroyed churches. The system of such socialism did not destroy a religion, it trampled on human spirit and destroyed people's wish to improve themselves. And now we have a shortage of personality. A shortage of individuality. A shortage of talent. A shortage of dignity. Perhaps this is the most terrible shortage—you cannot solve it with rationing.

And now life has called, but the leaders can be counted on one hand—Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Popov, Sobchak, Travkin, and Bocharov. The system of privileges more often than not only brings forth obedient subordinates. And perestroyka needs leaders. And there are tragically few of them. The majority of us have been too deeply

bitten by a comfortable feeling of our own nonparticipation, our irresponsibility, our indifference toward everyone and everything.

"What is it to me—do I have to do more than the rest?" "I am no worse than everyone else"—this is the philosophy that lives and flourishes. Here is one of the most graphic examples. Brezhnev with his orders and badges—he was a Gogolian personage who covered his personal emptiness with stars and medals. But are not we all peasants in serfdom, prostrating ourselves before a senile lord? And we have seen who is before us, but we have imitated the sweet faces of prosperous and happy subjects.

No, my dear compatriots, it is not just the party that needs repentance but also the people which, having clenched their teeth, remained silent and drank out of grief. Drank and stayed silent. Was this really necessary for the leaders of that time? Yes, it was necessary. And not only for them.

And now those who fear perestroyka began to get alarmed and worry as soon as they saw that the people were beginning to talk freely, albeit quietly. There is a saying that when the people sigh, there will be a storm. Was it not from alarm in the face of this storm that they began to talk about the loss of socialist landmarks, about anarchy, and about the loss of class evaluations?

Was this not the starting point for that show with the workers that was so clumsily staged at the Russian conference, when the workers themselves halted that not very important act of the congress of Russians. Why did they suddenly, as though they had just remembered, begin to entreat, "Our party is a party of the working class?" And was anyone really denying it? But something else is also clear: In the age of the technical revolution which has seized the entire world, without learned brains and true talents the workers alone cannot resolve the colossal technical tasks facing us when we have fallen so far behind in technology. No, of course not, answer the workers themselves.

And does not such hatred for cooperatives and leaseholders arise from this irresponsibility and unwarranted equalizing, which kills any initiative, and from this habit of receiving without always earning, which is ruinous for society? Did not the thirst for smothering the leases and these instances of burning livestock yards and destroying workshops arise from this?

The idea of unwarranted leveling leads to a lack of culture and to a brain drain abroad. Unwarranted leveling is not an achievement of the party but a justification of the destruction of everything talented, hard-working, unique, and everything that rises above the plane of mediocrity even if only by a centimeter. Unwarranted leveling is a chain around the neck of any movement forward.

They asked Vasiliy Leontyev, a Nobel Prize laureate and world-renowned economist, "What does Russia need to solve its innumerable problems?" He answered, "Individuals." It is only now thanks to Gorbachev's policy of glasnost and democratization that our talented people have quietly begun to come out of hiding, and voices are already crying out, "Gorbachev has lost the reins, and there is chaos, anarchy, the ruin of socialist ideals, and a decline in discipline in the country." But inside, hidden for the time being, are other thoughts: "It would be good to go back to the 'iron fist,' to unity and exclusivity of ways, and to orderly ranks where no one dared to make a sound of protest."

No, God save us from yet another "iron fist." That fist will bring us nothing but blood, repression, and reaction. It is not an iron fist we need but an iron, mighty state able to defend the citizens who are its wards, to defend itself, and not only to have the strength to compose good laws but the strength and opportunity to demand their rigorous implementation. We are tired of living for long years according to orders and instructions. We wish to live according to laws and common sense.

The soviets must be strengthened more quickly and turned into a mighty and independent power. But the party is more and more afraid of transferring too much to the soviets.

The law must rule, not the interests of any one organization, whatever it may call itself, and especially not one with an "iron fist." It is just these iron fists which have, for instance, run culture into the ground. Why has the monthly wage of cultural workers and artists, according to the calculations of economists, been reduced to the official poverty level? Why are more than 2,400 libraries in broken-down condition (without even mentioning the deplorable condition of the libraries of Lenin and Saltykov-Shchedrin)? Why do one-fifth of all theaters not have their own buildings (and we have 640 theaters in the country. Count them for yourself)? Why does the USSR rank 29th in the number of museums? Why... why.... The list of cultural catastrophes, unfortunately, goes on endlessly. What was the party doing for 72 years that it led culture to such a condition, such a scandalous condition? Why is the principle of financing culture after everything else still the "norm" even today? And the groans of cultural figures are drowned out by general conversation and by decrees which are not implemented. And what can culture expect after the transition to market relations? To take a back seat in everything? What does the congress have to say to the cultural figures? When will we understand that we are decivilizing ourselves, that ignorance is growing over the cultural level of life the way blue-green seaweed is growing over our rivers and reservoirs. We must save culture. Culture is immunity against savagery, ignorance, and barbarity. Without immunity, an undefended organism dies. Without the immunity of culture, society dies.

We have to do something. Well, let us say that as a sign of the seriousness of our intentions we will help culture.

Why not transfer the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA out from under the CPSU Central Committee to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture and the creative unions? Why not give culture just a bit of power? The newspaper would be a spokesman for the interests of culture and would efficiently comment on the most burning questions of the development of culture and art.

Another question. Why can we not avoid the sinister habit of always seeing the enemy in someone, whether it is "the yellow press," the informals, renegades at whom we must throw stones, journalists, or populists.

Over many years we have become used to seeing the causes for our blunders and failures not in ourselves but in someone else. It is easy that way. We cursed at the enemy, stirred up our allies against him, and we did in a way resolve the problem. And today the most resolute of us are publicly declaring that all other platforms must be banned and the members of these platforms must be excluded from the party. It is a remarkable and, most importantly, new solution. And it is rarely effective. And the people who are a little older remember where this road leads, and they shudder and look about themselves with fear.

And now they have thrown themselves on Gorbachev, accusing him of all sins and seeking in him, and only in him, the reason for our failures. I do not deny that there were mistakes. But Gorbachev is not being criticized for mistakes. He is being criticized because he personifies democracy, the party, and the people. He keeps them from turning back to the strong fist. It is a dangerous moment. This is where we get the proposal, insidious under these circumstances, to release Gorbachev from the party and only leave him as president. Today, (things have moved that far) it would be the greatest possible blow against democracy and glasnost.

Having removed the father of perestroyka, it will be possible to start after his followers and adherents. And it is not a question of Gorbachev himself, it is a question of the present situation, when in all the world Gorbachev (and everyone knows it) represents hope for peace and harmony. We cannot help but take this into account today. Otherwise we will break a fragile and delicate accord. It is maintained by well-known guarantors. And if we are led by these distantly aimed proposals, we will disrupt the world's equilibrium.

Think about it. All to whom the ideas of perestroyka are dear should defend the attempt to tear ourselves from the deathly grip of the administrative and command system. But the difficult congress of the Russian Communist Party has shown that it is not easy to shake it off. Many still hunger to return to their circles. Many, unfortunately, are prepared to turn back our society and again drive it into the stall of dogma, to the system of unwarranted leveling, to the Procrustean bed of bans and limitations.

Where the congress leads us is extremely important. Forward to a search for vitally important solutions, or back to the hollow rut of a dogmatic, motionless, often illogical condition which we for some reason call socialism. This is death. Questions, questions, questions. There are thousands of them. They surround us like monsters and ghosts, and we must answer these ghosts with all naked directness. And if we cannot, then how will the party be a vanguard party, that is to say a party that moves forward?

Or what if we do not wish to because it will lead to a fundamental redistribution and reexamination of many seemingly stable truths? And if we do not wish to, how is the party going to promise the people that it will resolve extremely important and vitally urgent problems without taking off the shackles of our dogmatic and obsolete principles, which do not allow us to take long steps?

But we must understand clearly that if we do not begin to search for answers to these damned questions and we do not solve the most vital of them today, then we will lose once and for all the trust of the people. And the trust of the people, as Vladimir Ilich Lenin said, is our basic capital. We can lose everything, but not the trust of the people. We must listen to Lenin's alarm. We must listen to Lenin's pain. We must listen to Lenin's warning.

Political and Social

Law Officers Discuss Decree Banning Armed Groups

LD2607165690 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—Soviet law enforcement officers met for a coordinating conference at the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office today. The conference was convened in connection with the presidential decree "On Banning the Formation of Armed Groups, Not Envisaged by the USSR Legislation, and Seizing Weapons in the Event of Their Unlawful Possession".

Speakers at the conference cited the following figures: 922 crimes linked with the robbery and use of firearms have been registered in the USSR in six months of this year alone. There were 955 such crimes in 1989.

Three hundred and eighty three people were brought to court in 1989 on charges of weapons and ammunition robbery. Twenty eight thousand people were penalised for the unlawful acquisition, sale, production, transportation and possession of weapons, ammunition and explosives.

USSR Deputy Prosecutor-General Vladimir Kravtsev said that weapons are stolen basically for the purpose of their subsequent transfer or sale to representatives of various armed groups.

He informed those present that the case of several members of the Latvian Social-Democratic Party was now under investigation. A large amount of weapons and ammunition were seized from them. They set up a covert militant organisation, which at one point transferred part of the weapons to the Karabakh committee.

Kravtsev also said that almost 10,000 weapons, 648 carbines, 511 automatics, 10 machine-guns, 204 pistols and over five tonnes of explosives were stolen during the developments in the Abkhaziyan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic and the South-Osetian Autonomous Region in 1989. Heads of local interior ministry bodies failed to duly counter these crimes.

Kravtsev said that people in Transcaucasian republics now own thousands of firearms and miscellaneous explosives. Only one small group of militants from the Azerbaijan Popular front in Jalilabad region owns 40 pistols, six automatics and over 600 guns. They create secret arms depots. Thirty eight automatic guns and 30,000 cartridges were seized from such a depot in Azerbaijan's Shaumyan district.

Kravtsev said that the situation in Armenia was as serious. Militants still have at their disposal a large amount of weapons, ammunition and military equipment, including four armoured personnel carriers, infantry fighting vehicle, 58 guns, mortars and anti-hail installations, 5,767 shells and missiles.

Kravtsev described the current situation in the country as regards arms robbery and their unlawful possession as an "exceptionally serious". He assured that the law enforcement agencies would use the full force of the law to prevent new crimes.

Moiseyev, MVD Aide on Decree

PM2607155190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interviews with Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and S. Liskauskas, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, by V. Litovkin and S. Mostovshchikov under the rubric "From Competent Sources"; place, date not given: "Weapons Must Be Surrendered"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Today we published the decree of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev "On Banning the Creation of Armed Formations Not Envisaged by USSR Legislation and the Confiscation of Weapons in Cases Where They Are Illegally Stored."

IZVESTIYA asked Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, to comment on its content.

[Moiseyev] This decree is extremely necessary: The situation in the country is exceptionally strained in view of the fact that a certain section of the population possesses of a large quantity of weapons and that illegal paramilitary formations have been created in a number of regions. Tension and instability are increasing, blood is being shed, and completely innocent people, women, children, old people, and servicemen among them, are dying. Homes are being razed and material assets created by the labor of the whole population are being destroyed. This cannot be tolerated any longer.

The government's previous measures, attempts at persuasion, and admonitions have not yielded results.

[IZVESTIYA] To what regions does the decree apply?

[Moiseyev] The entire territory of the Soviet Union, but in particular those regions where outbursts of violence and extremism are most acute and also those areas where illegal paramilitary structures—groups, detachments, militias, and even armies—have been created or attempts are being made to create them.

In the first instance practical measures will be taken against such formations in the Transcaucasus, Central Asia, the Baltics, Moldavia, and western oblasts of the Ukraine.

[IZVESTIYA] What is the Soviet Army's role in fulfilling this decree?

[Moiseyev] A limited one. The main task in fulfilling the USSR president's decree is entrusted to MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] troops and KGB organs. Military units and subunits of the Soviet Army will help them to confiscate weapons, ammunition, and combat hardware, to take them into storage and, where necessary, to blockade regions where illegal military formations are located.

We are also entrusted with the task of helping to establish the locations of weapons and munitions dumps and storage bases, maintain control on highways, and protect and defend major national economic facilities and institutions....

[IZVESTIYA] What forces and means will be used to perform the tasks that the Soviet Army has been set?

[Moiseyev] First and foremost the forces of the units and subunits stationed in those regions. It is not impossible that, when necessary, additional troop contingents will be drafted in.

[IZVESTIYA] What is your attitude toward the creation of republican armies?

[Moiseyev] Negative. I have already made numerous statements about this in the mass media and at congresses. I think that the creation of such armies tends to undermine the combat readiness of the Armed Forces and the country's defense as a whole, destabilize the situation even more seriously, and ultimately wreck the entire perestroyka process. [Moiseyev ends]

Commentary from S. Lisauskas, USSR deputy internal affairs minister:

[Lisauskas] It is hard for me to say what the total strength of the armed formations banned by the present USSR presidential decree is. Take the Armenian National Army [ANA], for example. Its leaders told me that the ANA has around 140,000 people. But I think that is wrong. It has fewer men, perhaps 10 times fewer. But this is my personal opinion, everything must be checked....

[IZVESTIYA] Can you tell us, even if only approximately, the total number of formations in the country of the kind mentioned in the decree?

[Lisauskas] As for those which have officially declared their existence, only one. That is the ANA. If there are others, they are clandestine. It is hard to say how many there are.

[IZVESTIYA] What specifically does the MVD intend to do in connection with the decree?

[Lisauskas] A plan of specific measures is being elaborated now.

[IZVESTIYA] The decree says that "participation by USSR Defense Ministry subunits is permitted in certain operations." Who will decide when an operation is ordinary and when it is "certain"?

[Lisauskas] The responsibility for implementing the decree is placed on the republic governments and also on the USSR internal affairs minister, the USSR KGB chairman, and the USSR defense minister.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you envisage the possibility of any complications in implementing the presidential decree?

[Lisauskas] I think that the possibility of such complications cannot be ruled out.... [Lisauskas ends]

From the Editorial Office: Responsibility for implementing this USSR presidential decree is also placed on the USSR KGB. When IZVESTIYA asked the USSR KGB press bureau to comment, the answer was: "We think that now is not the right time for this."

Kravtsov Discusses Illegal Possession of Weapons

LD2607203290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] A coordinating conference of leaders of the country's law enforcement bodies took place at the USSR Procuracy today. It examined measures to carry out the decree by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on banning the setting up of armed formations not provided for by USSR legislation, and the confiscation of weapons in cases of illegal possession.

Our correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov interviewed Vladimir Ivanovich Kravtsov, USSR deputy general procurator and state counselor of justice, first class:

[Begin recording] [Fedorov] Vladimir Ivanovich, according to official data, some 50,000 firearms are now in the hands of the population, including also, according to the military procuracy's data, some 1,000 Army firearms. Well, let's face the truth, these figures are clearly too low. These weapons bring too much trouble and sorrow.

[Kravtsov] I fully share your position. I think that we are far from the real situation.

[Fedorov] Have procuracy officials been waiting impatiently for this decree?

[Kravtsov] The situation in the past two years, and especially in the current year, has heated up to such an extent with the illegal use of firearms to date that the president's decree was simply imperative. I will quote only a few figures: Whereas during the whole of 1989 there were 955 cases of theft of firearms and ammunition in the country, during only six months of the current year, there have been 922 such cases. If one adds to this 28,000 cases of illegal possession and bearing firearms during the past year, these two figures together represent the real threat to Soviet people's security.

Regarding the execution of this decree, it envisages specific obligations and responsibility for fulfilling them for every law enforcement department— For the Internal Affairs Ministry, for the State Security Committee and even for the Defense Ministry—including, as you know, the special place and special role that the decree assigns to the Procuracy bodies. We regard it as our duty, above all, to ensure the strictest fulfillment of the law of criminal procedure when fulfilling the demands enshrined in the country's decree. This means: Timely discovery, full exposure, bringing criminal prosecution in good time and giving every person who has violated the existing criminal law his due. After all, the president's decree does not introduce any additional criminal liability. It only provides for prompt maximum measures to fulfill what had previously been enshrined in the criminal law as a whole.

At the moment I probably cannot speak about the entire program. Today we are conducting a coordinating conference of the central Union law enforcement departments, in which precisely this question of ensuring execution of legislation on the safekeeping of firearms and ammunition is one of the main issues.

In a whole range of regions we have analyzed and checked on this matter, and we have carried out procuratorial inspections.

Together with our colleagues from the Internal Affairs Ministry and the State Security Committee, we have inspected the state of safekeeping of arms at many, very many establishments and today we have, on the whole, a real idea of the difficult situation which has arisen in the country in this matter. I can tell you only one figure: In the country there are no less than 150,000 establishments at which firearms are kept, but the technical security of these premises and of the weapons themselves is far from what is demanded. And of course, the

increasing numbers of thefts, especially in the Transcaucasus regions, and indeed of open—let's be frank—methods of illegally capturing firearms, including combat weapons, are not fortuitous.

Kalugin Denies Revealing 'State Secrets' to Media

PM2707120990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jul 90 p 4

[Interview with former KGB Major General O. Kalugin by A. Tsatsuyev; place, date not given: "I Did Not Reveal Secrets"]

[Text] The press recently published an official announcement. It said: "The USSR Prosecutor's Office has instituted criminal proceedings in relation to the elements of a crime as laid down by Article 75 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Criminal Code (Revealing a State Secret)...." Former KGB Major General O. Kalugin is accused of revealing secrets in his media interviews.

We asked O. Kalugin himself to comment on this announcement. This is what he said:

"I believe that this is another attempt to 'muzzle' glasnost and frighten people, above all those who support me and particularly those who are KGB personnel; as well as an attempt to deceive the public.

"I have not been formally charged. Indeed, I certainly could not have been charged. Because, as it turns out, the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office has no documentation giving it the right to charge me with revealing state secrets. The only thing it does have is a decision to institute criminal proceedings signed by A. Vasilyev, acting USSR prosecutor general. This was reported by IZVESTIYA (see No. 207).

"Let me add that I do not consider that I have revealed any state secrets in my published statements. The KGB 'secrets' that I described can be ranked with the secrets of a corporation, but not of a state organization standing guard over the Constitution and over citizens' security. I have talked only about administrative ordinances of a kind that should not be employed in a rule-of-law state. Take, for example, even the most 'secret' document that I 'gave away'—an official instruction received by the KGB from the CPSU Central Committee. This document prohibits the collection or storage of any negative information on nomenklatura personnel and the mounting of any operational measures in relation to them. But its real point is to place the party, or more accurately its leading clique, above society. Should that kind of thing really happen in a democratic state?

"Then again, what I have told about the organs' activity abroad are 'secrets' long and well known to everyone." [Kalugin ends]

By the way:

As we know, O.D. Kalugin has been nominated a candidate for USSR people's deputy for National-Territorial Okrug No. 15. Yesterday he flew to Krasnodar Kray, where he will be meeting voters. An explanation given by the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office makes it clear that the institution of criminal proceedings against O. Kalugin "can in no way prevent him... from taking part in elections." In fact, in our view—such things have happened before—it could even help him...

Let me remind you, furthermore, of Article 50 of the USSR Law "On Elections of USSR People's Deputies," which says: "A candidate for USSR people's deputy cannot be arraigned on criminal charges, arrested, or be subject to administrative penalty imposed by order of a court without the consent of the Central Electoral Commission."

And I have another question. For Kalugin to be charged with divulging state secrets, there would have to be a law on state secrets. And there is as yet no such law.

KGB Official Reviews Measures Against Hijacking

LD2707100790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0547 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] I think those scary musical sounds are a highly appropriate lead-in to a very, very serious subject, a serious problem; that of air terrorism. Since the beginning of this year alone, as you know, there have been 14 attempted hijackings of Aeroflot aircraft and their passengers—with the destination of course, abroad. What view does the USSR Committee for State Security have of this problem? Our correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov interviewed Major Ruslan Sergeyevich Fadeyev, a staff member of a USSR KGB directorate:

[Begin recording] [Fedorov] Ruslan Sergeyevich, look at the situation we have reached: whereas people were previously frightened of using railway transport for perfectly well-known reasons, now they are frightened of flying on Aeroflot. The events of the past two months when 13 incidents of air piracy have taken place at intervals of literally a few days quite honestly are worrying the whole country. After all, each one of us is an Aeroflot passenger even if it is just once a year and each time the lives of many people, both in the air and on the ground, have been placed in serious danger. In addition, Aeroflot, too, has suffered losses running into many millions and damage has also been done to its reputation. No doubt the time has now come to put an end to all of this. What do you think?

[Fadeyev] I agree with you absolutely that incidents of this kind have no right to happen. The fact that this year terrorists have been able to carry out their criminal plans has exposed a lot of serious problems. They concern not only the flight security systems. There is an absence of civic responsiblity here on the part of individuals who knew about the crimes in preparation but who failed to sound the alarm in time. There is responsibility, too, on the part of those who, for the sake of sensational

reporting of the tragedies, talked more about the technology of air piracy without thinking about who is going to make use of this technology in the future.

[Fedorov] Here one thinks of the television film "Thunder" [Grom] about the capture of the (Ashkeyants) group of bandits, about the Ovechkin family and others and the series of aircraft seizures that followed it. But please go on.

[Fadeyev] The struggle against hijacking of civilian aircraft in the Soviet Union is carried out with close cooperation between detachments of the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR Committee of State Security. Each department carries out its own part of the work. The USSR KGB first and foremost carries out the tasks of discovering at an early stage individuals who are preparing to hijack an aircraft, exposing their plans, and preventing crimes. It is easier to treat an illness at the beginning stages. In preventing crime we are carrying out a humane function—we are saving a person for society and we are preventing him from making a mistake which would be impossible to put right.

Over the past five years agents of the Cheka have exposed and ended the practical activity of several hundred individuals who have been preparing to hijack aircraft. That is how tragedy was averted in the Maritime Kray. A group of cooperative members from Vladivostok who had failed in their business decided to recoup their losses at the state's expense. Their plan was to seize children as hostages and to issue an ultimatum demanding the immediate handing over of money amounting to several millions in the form of foreign currency together with an aircraft to take them abroad. Unfortunately there are quite a few such examples.

The state security bodies carry out regular training for operations under emergency situations involving the release of aircraft passengers taken hostage by terrorists. Our position is that in these situations the lives of people have to be preserved no matter what the conditions. This does not mean, however, that the terrorists will not be rebuffed. Eight attempted aircraft hijackings carried out this year have been cut short thanks to the professional actions of staff of the Committee for State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. At the same time none of the passengers or members of the crews suffered harm.

In view of the situation that has arisen additional measures have been taken by the departments concerned to prevent aircraft hijacking. In the first place these are aimed at raising the effectiveness of the preflight checks.

This year the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Committee for State Security, the Ministry of Defense, and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have worked out a draft state program for the security of civil aviation against acts of illegal interference. This contains an integrated system of measures—organizational, technical, and legal. In addition one direction of the fight against air terrorism is the development of international cooperation in cutting short crimes of this kind. Acts of air piracy are international in nature and throughout the world are regarded as most serious criminal offenses. The criminals are subject to the binding requirement that they be handed over to the country where they committeed their crime. The decisions of the Swedish and the Finnish governments to hand over Soviet citizens who have carried out hijackings overseas of aircraft this year have therefore been welcomed.

[Fedorov] Ruslan Sergeyevich, thank you for the interview. Incidentally what does the law lay down, what sanction does it provide, for the seizure or hijacking of an aircraft?

[Fadeyev] Deprivation of liberty for a period of between five and 15 years; but if people have died as a result of the actions that have been perpetrated, then the supreme punishment—shooting. [end recording]

Yakovlev Criticizes 'Conservatives' at Congress

PM2607153690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by INTERFAX chief editor M. Komissar and special correspondent V. Terekhov on USSR Presidential Council member Aleksandr Yakovlev's 23 July meeting with scientific staff members of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations: "Aleksandr Yakovlev: The Main Result of the Congress Is the Separation of Party and State Power"]

[Text] In his introductory address Aleksandr Yakovlev noted that he formed a twofold impression of the 28th CPSU Congress. First, it was one of the very few party congresses that can really—not as in the past—be called truly historic. I think this, he noted, because fundamental changes took place at the congress, which perhaps not everyone can see clearly yet. "It was at this congress that the most important thing happened, something that perestroyka was striving for and that we have already been talking about for many years: An actual separation of power—state and party power—took place. And I consider this, Aleksandr Yakovlev stressed, to be the main result of the congress. The party leadership now contains no one who holds any state post. That is a fundamental point. The party leadership is now formed in such a way that it is directly concerned with questions of the party's development. At the same time the party leadership will certainly be concerned with those socioeconomic problems that directly affect people."

Aleksandr Yakovlev noted that the process of creating the party is really beginning only now, because formerly the CPSU was built into the structure of the state administrative system. It is therefore necesssary today, in effect, to create the party from scratch, so that it concerns itself with party affairs, rather than commanding the masses. By withdrawing from direct state

and legislative power, the party has achieved its purpose by becoming an ideological force that can influence society.

It can also be considered an indisputable merit of the congress that it "thwarted an organized attack by the aggressively conservative right wing of the party on perestroyka. It seems to me that the 28th CPSU Congress created the prerequisites for the formation of a kind of left-centrist bloc in the party, which at this stage of our perestroyka could head, figuratively speaking, the second wave of the perestroyka processes. And that is also a very important result of the congress."

Unfortunately, the congress demonstrated very clearly, Aleksandr Yakovlev went on, the adherence of a significant proportion of the delegates to the old mentality of intolerance and distrust. In his opinion "the culminating point in the fate of the congress, and perhaps of the party itself, was the moment when it came to the point of the evaluation of the Politburo members' activity." He called this an opportunity for a "moral trial of party comrades," and stated that he would have walked out of the congress to avoid taking part in this, if it had happened. Every historian knows what the April 1929 plenum was like. At that time, in effect, there was a coup in the country. Then a trial of some of the party's leaders took place. How it ended, 10 years later, everyone knows well. There was a similar attempt this time, Aleksandr Yakovlev said. The conservative wing of the congress wanted to hold a trial of the Politburo members, or in effect a trial of perestroyka. I think it would have been immoral to participate in that court, irrespective of whom it evaluated and how. The continuation of this process would have led to a split. Considerable efforts had to be made and nervous energy wasted to ensure that the congress ended differently from the way the conservatives had planned, Aleksandr Yakovlev said. In his opinion approximately one-third of the congress delegates came to the congress in the clear knowledge that they want to reverse the country's course, revise perestroyka and everything associated with it, and return to the former comfortable system. Another section, perhaps slightly more than one-third, was prepared in principle to turn in the direction of those who are in favor of the continuation of perestroyka, or of those who are opposed to it. That is not because they are bad people, but because they did not have sufficient political experience, Aleksandr Yakovlev observed. That is why, in part, their sentiments did not reflect the sentiments of the masses, he said.

Thus, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council, stressed that it was to the credit of the congress that it did not allow the perestroyka process to be stopped. At the same time, unfortunately, the congress did not significantly advance the process, either.

Answering a question on the distribution of duties among members of the Presidential Council, Aleksandr Yakovlev said that the process has not yet been completed: "The Presidential Council is still in effect at the stage of formation. Some people already have specific functions, and some people probably will not be assigned specific functions."

Answering a question on the relationship between the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Presidential Council, Aleksandr Yakovlev noted that many people still cannot get used to the fact that Article 6 of the USSR Constitution has been abolished, so that neither the Politburo nor the CPSU Central Committee possesses state powers.

Speaking about the pace of perestroyka, Aleksandr Yakovlev noted that "perestroyka is a peaceful revolution, and as a peaceful process it presupposes a certain degree of spontaneity, and it would be wrong, and sometimes downright damaging, to hurry or artificially accelerate the course of events. That must be taken into account. The conservative section of the CPSU," he stressed, "must realize that it is time to stop sabotaging perestroyka. Only then will the party be able to play a major role in further social development."

Poll Registers Decline in Support for CPSU

LD270708159o Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 27 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—Although the prestige of the Soviet Communist Party is falling, a considerable number of Soviet people do not perceive any other real political force capable of overcoming the country's crisis.

According to a poll by sociologists of the Academy of Social Sciences at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee 37 percent of the public place their hopes on the CPSU, 29 percent believe there is an alternative force, and 32 percent have no definite answer.

The poll conducted last June in 17 regions of the country, questioned 1,864 representatives of all the major groups in the population, including 166 party and government officials.

Eighty three percent of those polled pointed out that the prestige of the Soviet Communist Party is on the decline. Sociologists recorded a particularly steep fall in the popularity of the CPSU Central Committee. During the poll conducted in November 1988, its activity was endorsed by 71 percent of those who answered questionnaires. Last June it was approved by only 21 percent of the polled.

Professor Nikolay Pishchulin, an author of the survey, links the crisis of confidence in the Soviet Communist Party with the continually falling living standards and growing social and political instability.

In addition, sociologists emphasise that methods of party work inherited from the past contradict the present renewal of society and have emboldened mass conscience.

The steep fall in the party's prestige is also explained by the fact that 66 percent of those polled believe that the Soviet Communist Party's work is more in the interest of party leaders and functionaries than the interest of the people.

However 32 percent of those people polled believe that leaders of alternative public movements also pursue their own self-interest.

Sociologists noted that despite the deepening of the crisis of confidence in the Soviet Communist Party, most people still link the country's future with the socialist choice. Fifty-one percent of those polled endorse the socialist choice, and 32 percent reject it.

The authors of the survey interpret responses to questions about the economy as showing that the erosion of socialist values and communist ideals is an emotional, rather than rational, force in society.

For example, 60 percent of those polled are against the unlimited introduction of private ownership with the use of hired labour, 20 percent favour this introduction, and the remainder are undecided. Sixty-five percent declared against permitted unemployment in society and 18 percent see it as a necessary evil.

Sociologists conclude that conditions still exist to consolidate society on the basis of the socialist choice and communist perspective. The Soviet Communist Party has support among the population and a certain credit of confidence. The sociologists believe that the programme of action stated at the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party is in keeping with the desires of the majority of Soviet people for well-considered radical transformations in the party and society.

Ivashko on Cooperation With Gorbachev

LD2607141790 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Excerpts] The past national Congress of the Soviet Communist Party instituted the post of deputy general secretary. Elected to the post was Vladimir Ivashko, who had been working as the leader of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Our reporter met him and here's the story he brought back. [passage omitted] Asked if he sought the post, he said the following:

[Ivashko in Russian fading into English report] (?I pushed) my way through; there are hundreds of people here in the congress hall who have known me from my young years and can confirm that statement. I am by no means fighting Ligachev, but we differ in our approaches. I think I'm beyond the point of no return.

[Announcer] [passage omitted] Now that he's got a Moscow job, will he become Gorbachev's shadow—his alter ego? Vladimir Ivashko.

[Ivashko] I have a very general idea of our future cooperation, but I don't think Gorbachev and I will be like siamese twins. He's got plenty of work and I'll have plenty of work too. Gorbachev and I are committed to the same ideas, strategy, and everyday policy. We'll formulate them together and then each will concentrate on his own work.

[Announcer] Fellow Ukrainians say Ivashko doesn't change as he moves up the ladder of power. He remains frank and accessible. As Ukrainian party leader, he relishes the public movement, (?dismissed) by the previous leadership, declared a war on departmentalism, and projected his views at a series of public gatherings. Will he stick to that style as the number two figure of the Soviet party?

[Ivashkov] Why not? We must have some contacts with various platforms and associations to human relations with them on a national scale. [sentence as heard] Society cannot survive if it's made up of deaf people. Regrettably, we often turn a deaf ear to each other. You may speak to a person and realize that he's not hearing you.

[Announcer] Or maybe pretends not to hear?

[Ivashko] Not at all. The trouble is that he really doesn't hear you. He is deafened by his stereotype. We've been dispelling stereotypes and broke many, but new stereotypes have sprung up. Therefore we need a cautious discussion and contact. We must galvanize the enormous intellectual potential of our people. It is the lack of democratic experience that makes people replace one set of stereotyes with another. Sometimes you can become popular overnight by saying a catchy phrase. Hence, we need to say I see no reason to avoid discussion, even with an out and out anti-communist. I know we'll split over fundamental issues, but if we agree on anything, that will be good.

Columnist Urges 'Defense of Perestroyka'

PM2607141790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

["Telegram to the Issue" from O. Semenchuk: "Let's Defend Perestroyka!"]

[Text] Moscow—I voice my extreme indignation at and disagreement with accusations against the leadership of the party and the country. The policy of perestroyka which it is being implemented deserves universal support. We do not have any crises, but there are various disturbances and difficulties artificially organized by the so-called antidemocracy with the aim of compromising both perestroyka itself and its leaders. Behind this lies a desire to change our state system and to put a puppet regime into power with a wild outburst of anticommunist and anti-Soviet forces. Yes, there are real complexities and difficulties, but they are being deliberately used by antidemocracy to organize all kinds of strikes, rallies, demonstrations, and economic sabotage. All this merely helps to worsen the internal political and economic situation in the country and discredits its leadership.

Individual sectors of the mass media are playing an inflammatory role in this. It is now clear to all honest people that the prestige of the party and of Soviet power is falling chiefly because of slander against them in these news media, which engage in defamation and dramatize our disorder. It is time to understand that slander of perestroyka can undermine the very idea of democratizing our society.

Accusations against the policy of perestroyka and the party leadership means provoking—I emphasize, provoking—disturbances, strikes, rallies, and pogroms in Moscow and everywhere; it means damaging the party and the country. The pseudodemocratic slanderers well understand this. According to their design, events in the USSR should have led to a repeat in a worse form the events in East Europe back in January-February 1990, when it was planned to replace the Soviet system, rout the CPSU, and put Communists on trial. But this did not happen here, and the credit for the fact that civil war did not ensue in the USSR belongs to the CPSU leadership and M.S. Gorbachev, who held the colossal onslaught of antidemocracy in check and preserved the unity and integrity of the party and the USSR. This is also the tremendous significance of the 28th party congress, which supported M.S. Gorbachev and expressed every confidence in him. The majority of the Soviet people have faith in Mikhail Sergeyevich and our Communist Party that they alone will hold out and overcome the onslaught of anticommunist forces in the name of democracy. I urge Soviet people to be vigilant and resolutely rise to the defense of perestroyka headed by M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Abalkin Views Transition to Market Economy

AU2607143790 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 26 Jul 90 p 11

[Report by "JS": "Abalkin: 'Our Society Is Weary of Waiting'"]

[Text] Duesseldorf, 25 July—"It would be desirable to have more time and more leeway of action, but our society is weary of waiting. It calls for speedy and resolute action," said Professor Leonid Abalkin, deputy Soviet Prime Minister, in Duesseldorf. Abalkin, who is one of President Mikhail Gorbachev's closest advisers and the spiritual father of economic reform in the USSR, is paying an official visit to the FRG from 24 to 29 July. Abalkin said that the Moscow government is aware that the way of reforms will be long and difficult. Until improvements can be expected, production in real terms will decrease further, there will be mass unemployment, and the living standard of the people will deteriorate even further. In the transition period, it will be necessary to help some sections of the people, such as pensioners, handicapped persons, and large families. A special program is currently being prepared for this purpose, said Abalkin.

The reforms will also include introducing the market economy in foreign trade and establishing the convertibility of the ruble, which can, however, only be done in stages. Abalkin said that a year ago, he believed that a period of 10 years would be required for making the ruble convertible. Many people even considered this expectation too optimistic. He said that he now believed that this process could be completed within five years. This would require a reform of the price system in the country, he said. According to Abalkin, initial steps in the direction of convertibility (change of the ruble rate, organization of a stock exchange) can be expected before the end of this year. The conversion of CEMA trade to a hard currency system must also be viewed in this connection. Abalkin said that an international congress will be held in Leningrad this fall to discuss problems related to convertibility.

Regarding criticism of the reform plans submitted by Prime Minister Ryzhkov in December 1989 and May 1990, which the Congress of People's Deputies remitted to the government for review, Abalkin said that one of the shortcomings of these proposals was that no consideration had been given to price reform. At the time, they believed that a price reform could only be considered if the goods supply, in particular the consumer goods supply, was improved. Meanwhile, on the basis of detailed analyses, they had arrived at the conclusion that the problems could not be solved without a price reform. That is the new philosophy of the government program which will be discussed in parliament and will already be initiated in part. In "denationalizing enterprises," the government will use the Polish and Hungarian experiences. The enterprises must not be sold out for nothing, as was done in some cases in Poland and Hungary with the participation of factory managers. By decree of the president, a special institute will be set up to define the terms for the issuance of shares. This cannot be left to the ministries, Abalkin said. It has already been decided on principle that foreign investors can also have one hundred percent subsidiaries in the Soviet Union. However, regarding real estate, the Russian tradition of lease will be continued.

The first batch of reform plans involving radical changes of the price, finance, and tax system will be submitted to the Congress of People's Deputies by 1 September. Because not all of the necessary laws on the introduction of market economy can be discussed and passed before the end of this year, some of the gaps will be provisionally closed by means of presidential decrees. In reeducating the people to think and act along market economy lines, the Soviet Union is hoping for help from the West, particularly from the Federal Republic, Abalkin said.

Abalkin did not deny that the reforms have been delayed too long. Some people think that five years have been wasted; others even speak about 25 or 73 years. He said that the government, which will have no summer recess this year, does not have time to take part in this discussion. Abalkin stressed that Moscow continues to have an interest in maintaining close economic relations

with the GDR. In 40 years of cooperation, a network of trade ties has been developed which cannot be easily dissolved. Therefore, the Soviet Government is also striving to continue these relations with a united Germany as well. Basically, Moscow and Bonn agree on this aspect.

More on Revenko's Union Treaty Press Briefing

PM2607150390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "What Kind Of Union Treaty"]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Jul—At a press conference in the capital with Soviet and foreign journalists today, Presidential Council Member G.I. Revenko advocated keeping the union of sovereign socialist states. It was devoted to questions relating to the conclusion of a new Union treaty.

In his view, the existence of a unified state is predetermined by history. Even today the sovereign Soviet republics cannot do without it for a number of reasons. For instance, only the USSR Government is empowered to tackle many questions. It has to monitor the implementation of international treaties and pacts on the territory of the country. Aside from questions over which the republics have jurisdiction, there are many common functions. Such as the practical implementation of the equality of all the peoples and the protection of borders; the formation of market relations in the country.

In view of the renewal of Soviet society, a renewed Union is also needed that fits normally into the modern world. It will be a democratic entity, G.I. Revenko noted. Therefore, the concept incorporates the principle of government not from the center, but from the republics themselves. The union must be built on the basis of their complete sovereignty and they themselves must decide whether to join it or not. The new state entity will be responsible for the republics and they, in turn, for the Union.

The Presidential Council member talked about the work that is being done to prepare a new Union treaty. A dialogue is now under way among the republics' governments concerning the basic provisions on which the treaty will be based. One of the most important principles is the principle of membership of a unified Union. According to the Presidential Council member, every republic must define what common powers it is transferring to the Union. And the fewer functions it delegates to it, the less opportunity it will have for participating in the elaboration of all-Union decisions.

Special attention was paid at the press conference to the economic aspects of the Union treaty. After all, the Presidential Council member believes, the formation of a market in the country and the development of new political relations are intrinsically linked. Therefore, mention was made of the importance of changing the structure of interrepublican links. Above all, they must be horizontal, so that enterprises and organizations are not afraid of pressure from above. To this end the USSR Government must abandon administrative functions and regulate economic processes using taxes. The system of foreign economic activity and pricing must also be revised. Only by establishing normal prices can efficient economic relations be arranged between republics.

G.I. Revenko stressed that the adoption of a new Union treaty will contribute to the solution of interethnic conflicts. Before this document is signed it is advisable to raise questions concerning disputed territories. It is proposed that work in this sphere should be carried out as follows: When definite accords have been reached the republics' Supreme Soviets will examine them and submit them for nationwide discussion. Not until the republic's population has come out in favor of joining the Union will the treaty be ratified.

The Presidential Council member answered numerous questions put by journalists.

CPSU Delegates Discuss Party Press Issues

90US1141A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report on meeting with delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress and PRAVDA editorial board in the PRAVDA offices, prepared by D. Gorbuntsov, V. Yegorov, and S. Pastukhov: "There Was a Candid Discussion"]

[Text] *As was already reported, a meeting of delegates and participants in the 28th CPSU Congress and the newspaper editorial board and its leading associates took place on Sunday in the PRAVDA offices. In an atmosphere of candid exchange of opinions, there was a discussion about the crucial problems of perestroyka and party renewal, about the course of the discussion that developed at the all-Union forum of communists, and about the tasks of the mass media under the conditions of glasnost and democratization of society.*

I. FROLOV, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and PRAVDA editor in chief. I am very glad that the delegates to the 28th congress have come to our editorial offices. Let us freely discuss the questions that were raised pointedly at the congress. Including about the work of the mass media.

A. ROMASHOV, chairman of the Krasnoyarsk City Soviet. During the period of the election campaign, at the party congress, and in the soviets hundreds and thousands of people expressed their wishes, and I shall take advantage of this occasion to convey them here—in the PRAVDA editorial offices. The wishes come mainly from people of the older generation. They ask that when publishing materials about our past the media take a cautious attitude toward history. Even if we are publishing evaluations of certain events, our evaluations should be weighed. Even if negative materials are published concerning certain periods in history, at the same

time materials should be presented that show the creative labor of millions of Soviet people on the labor front and their heroism during the war period and other periods. For now, unfortunately, in the mass media the labor of hundreds of millions of people has been impugned and presented basically as something negative....

REJOINDER. Right, we have these complaints as well....

A. ROMASHOV. And another question for you, Ivan Timofeyevich. How do you envision the next elections, when the party will be struggling under the conditions of a multiparty system? How do you envision this struggle?

I. FROLOV. I think that in a certain sense these elections will be even simpler for us, although there will be a lot of hard work to do. Why? Because I think our party will have a more clear-cut position. For now there is much that we do not understand. Such as when a person is a member of the CPSU but expresses views that essentially contradict it. And in the future much will become clear, positions will be presented more clearly, and the masses, the voters, will judge us and our views more definitely. I think that all this should begin right now, yes, actually, this has already started. For the party congress is like a large test for the country. I think we are now in the first stage of our struggle for confidence and respect for the party and for its members.

YE. RYAGUZOV, first secretary of the Berdsk CPSU Gorkom [City Committee], Novosibirsk Oblast. May I add a couple of words. The Soviet power organs have been formed as of today and a considerable proportion of the communists have been included in them. In our Berdsk Party Gorkom we see our task as making sure that party committees give a maximum amount of assistance to communist deputies in revealing their energy and capabilities to the voters. Thus in future elections the people themselves will see what the communist deputies have done and what other activists have done.

A. SIVILEV, colonel, Odessa Military District. I shall continue with the idea expressed by the first comrade about the mass media. I will say that recently the press has run a number of articles that are clearly tendentious and discredit the Armed Forces. Apparently certain leaders of the mass media are still not aware of the negative consequences of their actions, which are having an effect on the education of youth. But we are feeling this even now. This includes the refusal of military servicemen to perform their military service and do their constitutional duty. We are expecting that PRAVDA will run articles to augment in the press the traditions which instilled in our people patriotism and pride in their country. And, naturally, they should develop in youth a high degree of responsibility for preparation for army service itself.

S. PADUTO, deputy secretary of the Party Committee of the Svetlogorsk Khimvolokno Association, Gomel Oblast. The mass media did not do well by our congress: They divided us up too distinctly into radicals and conservatives. I think that we floundered during the first days and first hours of the congress simply because we were deliberately set off against one another beforehand. What is PRAVDA's position regarding this?

I. FROLOV. It would be better if you exchanged opinions among yourselves regarding this issue and judge it for yourselves. In general I reject any geometric approach to the determination of political positions. We must go forward and look for new paths in this constructive work we will have to do right now.

A. BARINOV, department chief of the Chita Medical Institute. When we speak about the past let us still recall that for a long time in the past it was thought in our country: One can sling mud at someone, but it is not good to talk about it aloud. Let us not think that any political article that is of a critical nature is necessarily slander, a desire to defame someone. We must speak about each article concretely and not in general. And one more thing. Here we are complaining about the fact that they have begun to divide us up into conservatives and radicals, and so forth. Comrades, we are proceeding toward a rule-of-law state! When these terms were labels which entailed political or perhaps even physical death, that was terrible. But today we must get used to normal political language which is accepted throughout the world. I think there should be conservatives in our party—that is normal—and there should also be radicals—that is also normal. There should be a combination of the old and the new in it.

S. GOIBNAZAROV, chairman of the rayon committee of the trade union of workers of the agroindustrial complex in Kuybyshevskiy Rayon, Kurgan-Tyube Oblast, Tajik SSR. Many of my fellow Tajiks—women and veterans—also asked me to speak at the congress and ask that the press not distort our history. This is especially painful for our elderly people who participated in the Great Patriotic War. On the pages of PRAVDA as well there are sometimes articles that are offensive in this respect, but it is good that this does not happen very frequently. But many newspapers distort history and our veterans' participation in it in any way they want to.

Now many people want us to have a multiparty system. I have this to say about that: What we need now is a strong Leninist party. In our region we are not yet prepared for a multiparty system. This is the opinion of many of my countrymen.

Now I am asking the newspaper PRAVDA, which our people respect, to print more material about the life of all women and especially Tajik women, who work 12-14 hours a day and because of this cannot raise healthy children.

M. TSIKHIYEV, director of the North Ossetian Drama Theater and member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. First, what I would like

PRAVDA to do. It has rarely dealt with questions of moral and ethical education. And in general our attention today is concentrated on getting rubles, on getting more to eat, and on the market. I do not deny the importance of these issues. But if society ceases to be moral, if it loses its spiritual values and nobody pays any attention to this, then no market, controlled or not, can help us.

What does society need? Society needs moral self-improvement. There are many variables in our culture—physical culture, the culture of drinking, parliamentary culture, and, excuse me, sexual culture. We have broken down culture as a unified, human concept into many derived parts. It is easier to cope with the general spiritual values of the people this way. And I would like very much for PRAVDA today not only to make political fodder but also to publish serious articles on preserving our moral values.

N. SHVETSOV, lumber truck driver, Chita Oblast. I would like to continue the discussion of the handling of history in the mass media. Is it really possible only to smear mud on our past. We must also remember the good things, for otherwise what will we teach our children? How to cover us with mud later? I understand the feelings of those people who all their lives have been devoted to the ideal, defended our homeland, and restored the postwar economy. How do they feel in their hearts when people say that they, as it were, sold their lives to the devil?

V. YAATSENKO, chief rolling mill operator of the Amurstal Plant, Khabarovsk Kray. We communists from the Far East, Siberia, and the Urals have serious complaints against the mass media. What are they? Today we are saying that we have factions and we should not be afraid of them, we should meet with their representatives, and speak with them. But why are the various viewpoints not reflected in the press? Here we have gathered at the Russian party conference. When we had our election campaign, when we were elected as delegates, the communists of the Far East knew that the conference could move on to the congress and that it would be necessary to elect management organs. We discussed who we would like to see in the post of first secretary and prepared campaigns for the Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party. And we have come to the conference with them.

By an absolute majority the delegates adopted a decision to rename the conference and call it a constituent congress, they elected the management organs and the first secretary, and agreed that we will conduct the congress in two stages. But what is happening? In literally two days we will arrive in Moscow for the 28th Congress and we will hear that our Russian congress was not authorized and that it selected the wrong people. And who will speak about this? Communists of Moscow and communists of Leningrad. I must say that we approached them during the recesses and asked: Comrade communists of Moscow and Leningrad, we are equal to you, we are examining your position and trying to learn from you, so why have you come to the Russian congress unprepared?

Why did we speak with them during the recesses? Because we could not get up to the microphone or push our way through to the television camera. The television crews know who receives the attention of the camera and who gets the microphone. When you turn on the television you always see the same faces. But why not take into account, say, our opinion, from the Far East, regarding one question or another?

G. BOYTSOV, bulldozer operator, Krasnoyarsk Kray. More about the question of creating the Communist Party of the RSFSR. Ivan Timofeyevich, I would like to know your opinion about that.

I. FROLOV. My attitude toward the creation of the Communist Party of the RSFSR is unquestionably positive. I regard this event as a large step in our political life. But the Communist Party of the RSFSR can carry out its mission only if it really does rally all of our party and act as a consolidating factor.

V. NOVIKOV, forester at the Makarov timber farm, Sakhalin Oblast. My comrades and I think that PRAVDA did a large amount of work before the 28th Party Congress. And the most noticeable success is the "Discussion sheets." I must admit that we did not react to them immediately. But then many people started coming to me and asking: Why is there no "Discussion sheet" today? Indeed they did reflect thoughts that were bothering the people. Both party and nonparty members could make their views known without interference. It seems to me that this is very good.

Now I would like to say this. We have now gathered and are speaking mainly about PRAVDA. And our party press begins with the rayon newspapers. What fate awaits them after the congress? For in certain rayons the soviets have now raised point blank the question of turning these newspapers over to them. Will any documents concerning the party press be adopted at the congress?

N. SIDORCHUK, secretary of the party committee of the Krasnoyarsk silk combine. In my opinion, it is too soon for us to begin to divide the press up between the party and the soviets. On the contrary, each newspaper should consolidate both communists and nonparty members. At our combine, for example, the editor of our newspaper is not a party member. The director of the House of Culture is not either. We are now getting cable television which will work for the entire combine. We have set up 36 points in the shops, day rooms, and cafeterias. We are preparing programs. We have cameras and have purchased video equipment.

REJOINDER. That is very interesting.

N. SIDORCHUK. We are working for the entire combine and we are not separating communists from noncommunists. Ten deputies to the soviets were elected from our combine. Communists and nonparty members.

But when we went to the elections we gathered together and decided upon a unified platform. And most of the voters supported us.

T. ISMAILOV, general director of the scientific production association of space research, Azerbaijan SSR. I would like to ask PRAVDA to aim toward crucial subjects in bold, analytical articles. The fact is that we need a fairly large amount of information both from television and through other channels. But the party press should provide, as it were, a digested version for the personal interpretation of the communist reader. That is the first thing. Now the second thing. Our delegation from Azerbaijan came to the congress with a unified platform—a platform of consolidation of all healthy forces around the party Rules, around the program we are developing, but necessarily taking into account the independence of the republic party organizations. We have complaints against the press, including PRAVDA, concerning the coverage of interethnic problems. They should look at these more broadly—primarily from general party and general state positions.

V. SABOSTOV, diamond cutter at the Kristall Plant. First of all PRAVDA should be more active, take more interviews from congress deputies, and, perhaps, hold its own press conferences. And now about the main thing. I cannot skip over the Chernobyl problem. In my view, it is reflected quite inadequately in the newspaper. And, after all, this is not just our problem but a common human problem. But not everything has been clarified yet, even in our republic.

V. POLYAKOV, first secretary of the Sovetskiy Party Raykom, Gorkiy Executive Committee. It is symbolic that we have gathered here at PRAVDA on PRAVDA's street. Everybody is calling the time we spent before the 28th congress a lesson in truth. And I would probably call the congress itself a congress of truth. If only because it reflects the diversity of all viewpoints, the entire spectrum of opinions of communists and nonparty members. I would not like our discussion to be turned into a press conference. Therefore I am not asking questions but will express my own opinion about PRAVDA. Outside the walls of our meeting, so to speak, it has been said that the newspaper is printing all kinds of things just as long as they do not offend anyone. This is understandable. But the reader is not likely to approve of indifferent attitudes toward the problems covered on the pages of newspapers. A mechanical approach is quite unacceptable here. There is no need to print the "for—against;" we need a weighed, political, ultimately communist evaluation.

A brief remark about the idea expressed here concerning the correctness of dividing people into radicals and conservatives. They say this is normal. Yes, it is normal but only if these are not transformed into labels and then into nicknames.

N. KIM, history teacher from Khabarovsk Kray. May I make this request? When I was running for the congress I was asked this question: How do you teach party history without a textbook? I answered: I try to speak in the language of truth. It would be good if the newspaper would turn to the pages of history more frequently, taking the needs of educators into account. Someday they will start writing textbooks again!

I. FROLOV. All right. We will consider that.

Z. VERDIYEVA, rector of the Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages. The country has been engulfed in the fire of ethnic hostility. Who thinks, is disturbed, and sounds the alarm more than women and mothers seeing the death of their children. And we do not understand the complacency of our president. I am addressing my question specifically to him because the discussions at all levels of leadership both here in the republic and the CPSU Central Committee have shown that only one person can make this decision.

V. VASILYEV, steam engine mechanic from Kholmsk in Sakhalin Oblast. Perhaps the leaders of the republics themselves are in a position to solve these problems locally. Without intervention from above.

Z. VERDIYEVA. Yes, we could have solved it if the problem had not gone on for so long.

V. VASILYEV. You understand that the conflict in the Transcaucasus is perceived differently by different people. About 3,000 mothers from the RSFSR, Belorussia, and the Ukraine wrote a letter asking that their sons not be sent to Armenia and Azerbaijan. The people do not understand why such large republics and peoples with rich culture cannot find a common language.

V. KUTSENKO, first secretary of the Groznyy Party Gorkom. At the 28th congress I have not yet found an answer to this question: Why are the masses of workers still standing on the sidelines of perestroyka? Why has it not become their personal business? Many are waiting and that is all. It seems to me that a mistake has been made. We began the processes of democratization and glasnost in a country where the sphere of distribution was practically totally deformed. And it is not surprising that many, so to speak, instruments of glasnost ended up in the hands of the shadow economy. Each day it produces a circulation of billions, and while we are sitting around talking and philosophizing, it is gathering strength. And we are the ones to be tossed overboard from the boat in which we are being called to consolidate. Alone, and silently. Some party and soviet workers and even workers of the Department for Combating Theft of Socialist Property are infected with corruption. It is possible to consolidate with the "Democrats" or the "Marxists," but do we have to consolidate with this segment?

V. KOSULIN, shop chief of the Tambov Revtrud Association. I would like to raise this problem. People say that a complete broadcast of the congress on television costs

a lot of money, but they frequently broadcast all kinds of rubbish. Does this mean that money is not a problem for it?

N. IVANOV, first secretary of the Barnaul Party Gorkom. From the statements of many of our colleagues today I have understood that during past decades our party lost the ability to determine the interests of the people and include them in its policy. This is the first lesson we must learn from our congress. We must create a mechanism for accounting for the interests of the people which would then make it possible to make party policy an instrument for satisfying these interests. The second question. For a very long time we limited ourselves to the policy of the iron curtain and we stood still while the rest of the world was moving way ahead. Everyone must draw this conclusion: the radicals and the conservatives and those in the middle.

And one more lesson: Our party is getting old. Even our city party organization, where the average age is forty six and a half...

M. MIKITIN, first secretary of the Kamensko-Bugskiy Party Raykom of Lvov Oblast. For us communists of the Western Ukraine the problem is much more complicated because the oblast party organizations not only in Lvov Oblast but also in Ternopol and Ivano-Frankov Oblasts have lost their leading position. We lost the political battle in the elections to the local soviets.

Yesterday I had a chance to see the film by the director Govorukhin "We Cannot Go On Like This." But in my opinion director Govorukhin cannot go on doing what he is doing either. Yes, he cites and shows true facts. But, comrades, let us look at some other facts as well! There are still some good things that have been done in the country over 70 years. I would like PRAVDA to help us figure out how we are to proceed from here.

And another thing. I think it is quite necessary for our PRAVDA to have an ongoing discussion of the implementation of decrees that have been or are being adopted by the CPSU Central Committee. For many good decrees have been adopted. Why not monitor the implementation of all of them on the pages of PRAVDA?

I do not know what decisions we shall make at the congress, because the discussion is not about the basic documents and resolutions. But the most important task, in my view, is to work together to develop good strategy and tactics for the CPSU under the conditions that have developed today in the Western Ukraine, the Baltic states, Moldavia, Transcaucasia, Moscow—in a word, throughout the country.

V. SEKRETARYUK, first secretary of the Lvov Party Obkom. I wish to add to what my countrymen have had to say. The fact is that the difficult political situation, against whose background the difficult events in the western oblasts of the Ukraine are developing, in my view, requires that the press give them fair coverage. In a situation in which the monopoly on power of the Communist Party is being replaced by the entry of other forces into the political arena, it is very important to find ways to achieve harmony, peace, and mutual understanding, and to refrain from stereotypes and dogmas and the attaching of political labels, with which the people are fed up. It seems to me that PRAVDA's policy for covering these issues must be changed. For a beginning, for example, it would be worthwhile to discuss at least the activity of party organizations that are working under the conditions of opposition.

A. SOKOLOV, first secretary of the Khabarovsk CPSU Gorkom. Many newspapers have long been known for their sympathies and antipathies. PRAVDA should have its own image as well. It is primarily a newspaper of communists, a party newspaper and, undoubtedly, it can only stand to gain from the clarity of its positions. But so far, unfortunately, I have noted that PRAVDA, for instance in its "Discussion sheets," is very cautious when it comes to talking about alternative platforms and trends, almost praising their authors. But the CPSU Platform has been forgotten. True, in recent days, right before the congress, they have begun to speak about it as well. But this should have been done more forcefully and it should have been started earlier.

And in general PRAVDA and PRAVDA workers should not be afraid to take the offensive. Even here at the congress, for example, they should comment more boldly on the positions of the delegates who speak. And another thing. Sometimes the newspaper prints materials which show how right the correspondent was in the preceding article. I think they should also print articles that would recognize that the newspaper was not right in one situation or another. This would be to PRAVDA's advantage—the only people who do not make mistakes are those who do not do anything.

It seems to me that the newspaper should always be covering youth problems on its pages as well.

A. BARINOV. Unfortunately, PRAVDA does not lavish its attention on young people. Just take the coverage of the constituent congress of communists of the RSFSR. Your newspaper conveyed the viewpoint of the majority well but completely ignored the minority, including youth. And yet there was a declaration of 22 young communists. It seems to me that PRAVDA could not have "failed to notice" this declaration. Its authors were not simply young delegates, they were part of the younger generation. And if we want the younger generation to continue to follow the party we must devote special attention to this category of communists. Otherwise the thread that links the party to the younger generation could become thinner and thinner and at some point break.

F. BADALVEYLI, professor at the Baku Conservatory. Whether we like it or not, all of us will have to live under a multiparty system. And in order for the authority of my party, the party of communists, to increase from day to day, I, as a cultural worker, am making a concrete

suggestion. Taking into account the catastrophic situation with culture, science, education, art, and public health in our country, I suggest that a half of a percent of our membership dues be used for the needs of the humanitarian sphere. With this money we will construct schools, hospitals, houses of culture, libraries, theaters, philharmonics, museums... Imagine, inscribed on them will be: "Built with funds from the Communist Party." I do not know what other parties will do in this area. But we would gain immense respect in the eyes of the people.

YU. GRUDIN, chief of the Sverdlovskiy Rayon internal affairs division of the internal affairs administration of the Krasnoyarsk Kray . I want to support the preceding speaker with all my heart. For the roots of many of our problems lie precisely in our lack of culture. For example, I was very struck when at the congress they "applauded" and "drowned out" the speeches of Comrades Ulyanov and Kugultinov and did not want to listen to these wise people. For they were talking about the main things we are lacking today. I think that priority should undoubtedly be given to questions of culture in the party documents, including the documents of our congress. And for PRAVDA workers I have this request: Provide more material on the history of art, its modern trends, and real culture. And also the congress should be discussed more critically.

Now, as concerns discussions of depoliticizing internal affairs organs, since I myself work for the law enforcement organs I think that they should be depoliticized today, that is, they should eliminate the political departments, replacing them with social security organs. As concerns "departmentalizing," I do not think we should give in to this, and party organizations should not be left in the internal affairs organs.

But it seems to me that it would be impossible to depoliticize the Army until we make it purely professional.

V. ZEMLYANSKIY, first secretary of the Kuznets CPSU Gorkom, Penza Oblast. I wish to return our conversation to the main subject—the relations between the party and its central organ, the work of the congress, and its coverage on the pages of PRAVDA. I do not agree with those who think that PRAVDA is a faceless newspaper. On the contrary, recently it has conveyed its own image and its own clearcut position. For example, I recall the statements on various tendencies by members of the Party Central Committee and members of the Politburo. Attention should be given to a whole series of precongress "roundtables." It would seem that we should also continue the discussion of party renewal, having initiated it, perhaps, in a new channel with the speeches of the delegates to the 28th CPSU congress and the rank-and-file communists and secretaries of shop party organizations. In the second place, speaking about discussions, one must say that these materials do not contain enough of your own opinions, the opinions of PRAVDA workers, on various issues (incidentally, this was also emphasized in a recent Central Committee decree on the newspaper PRAVDA). In general I would like the PRAVDA editors and correspondents to make their positions known as well.

And, in my opinion, it is very important in these difficult times to publish something good in addition to critical materials. For instance, at one time PRAVDA published excellent sketches of party workers. It would probably be worthwhile to continue this worthy undertaking.

V. VASILYEV. I wish to ask a question of the whole audience. Comrades, what is a rank-and-file communist?

VOICE. A rank-and-file communist is one who does not have a briefcase.

V. VASILYEV. No, Comrades. There are neither communist generals, nor communist colonels, nor rank-and-file communists. And all of us, including the members of the Politburo and our general secretary, are simply communists. And let us call ourselves that.

N. SVETKIN, director of the Aleksandrovsk-Sakhalinsk pedagogical school, Sakhalin Oblast. I wish to focus your attention once again on the question of turning the power over to the soviets. True, the comrades from the Western Ukraine have already touched upon this. But it is so serious that its elucidation is a large problem for PRAVDA as well. In any case this work can certainly not be called organized. I think we should look for good, positive "kernels" of experience and show normal, democratic transfer of power to the soviets. And the other side of the matter—legislative—should also concern us. How is this being done now, for example, in the adoption of laws in the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation? This kind of legislation, in my view, will come back to haunt us later. Therefore I would ask PRAVDA workers to raise these problems on the pages of the newspaper as well.

K. SHAVARSHIN, chairman of the Chita Oblast Executive Committee. As we know, many new newspapers have now appeared. But I have always read and always will read my PRAVDA. I would like its workers to continue in the future to be the most respected in their profession and not to disappoint our expectations. Write more about life in the remote areas. For example, I would like to read on the pages of PRAVDA about what the so-called "silent majority" thinks.

YE. KHARITONOV, first secretary of the Labinsk CPSU Gorkom, Krasnodar Kray. The questions being raised here are very important. But it does not seem to me that we have discussed yet such a significant area of party work as the system of selection and placement of personnel and its coverage in the press. Take, for instance, the forthcoming elections in our congress. It is no secret, after all, that the majority of Politburo members will be reelected. But which of us congress delegates or you journalists of the main newspaper of the CPSU can say which known leaders of our party and eminent specialists in various areas of work will be recommended

for these posts? And how do the local party organizations and communists of the country feel about them?

I do not know about you, but I am bothered by the possibility that there will again be secret conferences, proposals, and improvised solutions regarding this most important question.

And here I ask myself the question: What can defeat perestroyka today? A multiparty system, interethnic relations, conflicts between left and right, a market economy? Alas, first in line, in my opinion, is the formation by certain mass media of a view of our party as almost something like the "enemy."

In order for this not to happen, our newspaper PRAVDA must fight above all for political stability and for consolidation. Of course, not with an iron fist but with the help of a highly cultured political dialogue among leaders of various platforms and trends in our party and other parties and various political organizations.

A. MALOFEYEV, first secretary of the Minsk Party Obkom. I think that the main thing today is to do everything possible so that our congress will be constructive. There is no point in inflaming passions further. If we reduce things to a clarification of personal positions the congress might not be able to carry out its task.

My colleagues and I are also bothered by attempts to set congress delegates off against party organizations and present the congress as conservative and incapable of solving its own problems. If these ideas become widespread the consequences could be unpredictable. People in the party organizations are beginning to get nervous about this. Great hopes are placed in PRAVDA—it is capable of rectifying a great deal.

But today we apparently need to do more than simply take some position. We must defend the party wherever there is a need for this. We have reached the point of the absurd—in the same party people sometimes proclaim Marxism-Leninism, and sometimes they say "give us capitalism!" Sometimes they demand that the property be divided up... Well, when and where has this happened? And in this situation is a political organization, even such a tempered one as the CPSU, capable of solving the complicated problems associated with perestroyka? Apparently, the main thing for us today is to develop a clear and concise policy.

I especially wish to discuss a subject that has already been raised here by my countrymen, the Belorussian communists. This is the subject of Chernobyl and everything associated with it. It would be no exaggeration to say that after the Chernobyl calamity our republic became a national disaster zone. This is literally a question of the survival of the people. And it would seem that PRAVDA should discuss more frequently what is being done in our local area to combat the consequences of Chernobyl.

I. FROLOV. We are grateful to you, comrade delegates, for finding time on this Sunday to come and visit us. Concluding the discussion, I should like to emphasize that we all need to engage more actively in concrete work. We are at a turning point and now we must do everything possible so that our congress will come up with constructive decisions regarding party renewal. As concerns PRAVDA, it will actively contribute to all positive processes taking place in the party and society.

...The meeting lasted several hours. Of course, we are not able to print all of it. But it seems to us that the discussion was indeed not only candid but also substantial. The reader can be convinced of this with his own eyes by watching the television broadcast concerning the meeting which Central Television plans to air today.

Economic

State Budget Deficit Down to 24 Billion Rubles

LD2607123490 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—It is only possible to get out of the economic crisis in the Soviet Union by changing the entire economic system to secure that relations of ownership change and that not only one or several brains manage the economy "from above." Every person should have a say in economic matters, Soviet Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov told the newspaper TRUD.

He believes that the economic crisis resulted from inviable political doctrines and serious errors made by the country's former political leadership who protected the sacred norms of levelling, cultivated primitive exchanges in kind, and increasingly lagged behind the times.

"The inefficiency of the system is illustrated by the low productivity of social labor and the lack of interest in attaining high results," Pavlov said.

"Strikes cannot improve the situation: There is almost nothing to distribute and money becomes increasingly 'empty'," he said.

Speaking of ways to transfer to the market, Pavlov said that the process should not start with an increase in retail prices.

"It is essential to change wholesale and purchasing prices and price formation in a centralised manner, without changing basic retail prices, primarily of food and a number of basic necessities. Grants should be given not to manufacturers of goods but to trade," he said.

According to preliminary data, the emission of money amounted to 10 billion rubles [R] in the first six months alone, which equals the entire amount planned for the whole year, he noted.

Although the country's financial position is rather complex, it is not disastrous, Pavlov believes.

The state budget deficit over the six months was reduced to R24 billion whereas only recently it ran at R120 billion, he said.

Much will depend on the economic program to be adopted by the Soviet parliament at its autumn session, Pavlov emphasized.

Katushev Assesses Convertible Currency Trade

LD2607213490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by correspondent Mikhail Solntsev]

[Text] As you know, the USSR president has issued a decree on making changes in the Soviet Union's foreign economic practice. Our correspondent met Konstantin Fedorovich Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations.

[Begin recording] [Solntsev] The first point is that from 1 January we are going over to trading for freely convertible currency with the CEMA countries. What are your comments regarding this?

[Katushev] This decision, which has now been given legislative form by the president's decree, was prepared by the entire preceding course of our relations with the CEMA countries, by the proposals that were drawn up by the government and put forward by Comrade Ryzhkov to be discussed and adopted by the CEMA member countries at the January session in Sofia, and by the negotiations on transition to such a payment and settlement system which, on the instructions of the government, we had already held with all countries.

[Solntsev] What will this provide, say, for you and me as ordinary consumers?

[Katushev] For me and you as ordinary consumers it will firstly provide an opportunity to obtain high-quality goods from all foreign countries. Second, for the producer, conditions have been created both in our own country and for our partners in CEMA whereby the producer, in real existing conditions, will be more interested in selling his goods for freely convertible currency and be less interested in selling his goods for transferable rubles with which he has been unable to buy what he needs. Now transition to payments in freely convertible currency and at world prices will create such opportunities for producers.

We do have a certain category of commodity deliveries—mutually balanced deliveries—that will evidently continue in relations between the CEMA member countries, but the opportunity of rejecting low quality goods from a partner will of course be an element of market relations and something that will put pressure on the producer. [end recording]

Abalkin Defends Government's Reform Course

904A0511A Moscow VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA in Russian 14 Jul 90 p 2

[Report on interview with L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA correspondent I. Krylov; date not given: "Will There Be a Makeup Exam?"]

[Text] **The miners have had a strike. Their main demand was the retirement of the USSR Government and the formation of a government of national accord. Let us recall that in spite of the sharp criticism of the new government program by almost all the country's leading economists and the thinly veiled hints of a number of deputies during their discussion of lack of confidence in the government, the talk about its retirement, as a VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA correspondent put it, were greatly exaggerated. Deputy A. Boyko was extremely positive toward the USSR Council of Ministers. He was speaking on behalf of the parliamentary commission and had taken on the work and responsibility of actually defending for several hours the program for changing over to regulated market relations while the authors of this program were simply in attendance in the meeting hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet. But he declared: Our line of credit for confidence extends only until fall. By that time the government must present a concrete plan for the consideration of the deputies.**

In essence this meant: The government has failed its exam, and a makeup exam has been scheduled.

Recently the USSR president announced that it was impossible to start a reform with an increase in prices, which actually expressed his attitude toward the government program. But if one pays attention to the statements of a number of members of the cabinet of the USSR Council of Ministers, their position remains essentially unchanged.

Actually, even during the discussion of the program in the USSR Supreme Soviet one could anticipate the mass dissatisfaction of the people (right to the point of strikes) and the rejection of the program by the parliamentarians of a number of republics. Our correspondent asked Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, about this during the break between meetings of the Supreme Soviet.

[Krylov] Do the positions taken by the Supreme Soviets of a number of republics not impede the implementation of this program?

[Abalkin] Yes, we are now in a difficult period of interethnic relations. The implementation of the government program for changing over to the market undoubtedly requires the resolution of a number of issues having to do with our state structure—above all the development of a new Union treaty. Without this, of course, it is very difficult to move forward. But the main idea of the program—a unified unionwide market—in my view, is

economically attractive to all the republics. As concerns the interaction with the Supreme Soviets, these questions should be decided by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The government can conduct negotiations and reach agreements only with republic governments. And we have conducted them with all 15 republics. We have achieved what I regard as a large step forward—the agreement of the governments of all the republics of Central Asia regarding raising grain prices, taking into account compensation for the traditionally national structure of consumption. As we know, the per capita consumption of grain, rice, and flour in Central Asia is much greater than in other regions of our country.

[Krylov] Will the society as a whole accept your program?

[Abalkin] Our society has no other choice: either mark time and wait for the crisis to deepen, or begin to move forward. We can move more quickly or more slowly, we can clarify dates and details, but the main thing is to begin finally to move. And I think society in principle will support movement forward rather than shifting from one foot to the other.

[Krylov] A number of people's deputies have convincingly criticized the government program for not being radical enough....

[Abalkin] We are always having to respond to two kinds of reproaches: Some say "too slow" and others, "too fast." And I respond to both like this: We must walk on earth and not have our heads in the clouds. Let us proceed from the real situation—the country is not ready for the market. The mass consciousness is not ready, we have no market structures, release of property by the state, a convertible ruble, stock exchange, and many other things. How can we proceed toward the market more rapidly without all of this? Our program proceeds from reality, responsibility to the people. And suggestions to move toward the market more rapidly are based more on emotions than on an accounting for the real processes in the country.

[Krylov] Are you familiar with the suggestions of Artem Tarasov, an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy and well-known entrepreneur? What do you think about them?

[Abalkin] I consider them a myth. There is not a single serious economist who would support such an unprofessional concept. Of course to cut all prices in half sounds nice. Especially at rallies. But how are we to keep prices at such a low level? After we cut market prices are we also to reduce procurement prices in agriculture? Such prices would never cover expenditures. As for his proposals on foreign trade, it is impossible to apply the conditions of one joint enterprise to the functioning of such an extremely complex mechanism as our economy.

[Krylov] The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, B.N. Yeltsin, has declared that Russia has an alternative variant of changing over to the market, not through increasing retail prices and lowering the standard of living of the population.

[Abalkin] It is impossible to change over to the market without losses. So far Yeltsin has not proposed a single concrete economic plan. I think we should lay our cards on the table and not play them close to the chest; present a document and then we will discuss it in detail.

[Krylov] Leonid Ivanovich, when can we realistically expect improvement of our economic situation?

[Abalkin] This problem has various aspects. There are global indicators: When the national income begins to grow, there will be significant improvement of the standard of living. But this will take two to two-and-a-half years. But there are also smaller results which are nonetheless extremely important for each family. If we really do raise the minimum wage and minimum pensions and through compensation repay the population for price increases, as our program indicates, then millions of people, entire segments of the population, will feel the results immediately. For the real buying power of underprivileged segments of the population will increase. The situation could worsen not for pensioners and students, but for workers. Or, rather, the ones who have become unaccustomed to working. The logic of the market is such that if your standard of living declines, it is not the government that is to blame but you yourself. The government gives you every opportunity for business initiative, enterprise, more intensive labor, and thrift. If you have not been able to realize them and your earnings have suffered as a result, blame yourself. Of course, you cannot transform all lazy people into creative workers with initiative immediately. Many will prefer to continue to go around with their hand held out, demanding benefits and privileges from the government. If we did not have workers like these, our country would not have to anticipate any economic slump. The main thing is for us to be firm enough in implementing all the measures that have been indicated.

Abalkin Delivers Report on Economic Strategy

LD2607210190 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn July 27 TASS—"Soviet society unequivocally opted for a regulated market economy. All doubts and hesitations on this issue occur within the framework of this choice," visiting Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin said here.

Abalkin delivered the report "The USSR's Economic Strategy for the 1990s" at the Konrad Adenauer Foundation on Thursday.

He emphasised that it was planned to start implementing, since the beginning of next year, a package of

agreed-upon and well-coordinated measures to introduce elements of a market economy.

The measures include new pricing and taxation systems, the financial-credit reform, various forms of ownership and measures for the social protection of the population. He said what was already happening and would be implemented in the USSR could be described as a revolution.

Abalkin expressed hope that Western countries, including West Germany, would give large-scale assistance to the Soviet Union to involve it in the world economy which was in the interests of all peoples.

Answering journalists' questions during a news conference here, Abalkin positively evaluated the state of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and West Germany. He said the main emphasis would now be put on the development of links between the two countries' enterprises and firms as the main subjects of the market economy.

Abalkin said the government would work to create favourable political and economic pre-conditions for intensifying this cooperation. He noted that this did not rule out but presupposed the conclusion of large intergovernmental agreements in this area.

Abalkin said that priority would be attached to those areas of cooperation which would help solve urgent economic problems and also effect economic reforms in the USSR.

Methods for Change to Market Economy Cited

PM2607112590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by I. Demchenko: "Many Programs and Little Time"]

[Text] The first results of the activity of the commission for assessing alternative options for the transition to a market economy were described to Soviet journalists by Academician A. Aganbegyan and Doctors of Economic Sciences B. Milner and N. Shmelev.

By some irony of fate the commission defined for itself exactly 13 problems according to which the incoming proposals will be generalized. They include urgent measures to stabilize the economy, the creation of a system of entrepreneurship in the country, proposals for the normalization of the consumer market, the formation of a securities market, foreign economic questions, and interaction between the republics and the central authorities. So far, according to A. Aganbegyan, the commission has an ocean of proposals for specific individual topics and 21 items laying claim to being comprehensive.

The commission, created a month ago at the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers, includes scientists and scientific workers, people's deputies, leaders of industrial and agrarian enterprises, and representatives of ministries and departments. A. Aganbegyan, who heads this collective of "divergent thinkers," said that the irreconcilability of positions during the work is sometimes expressed "it cannot be said in mutual insults but in something that comes close." Incidentally, it is interesting that the chairman himself learned of the commission's creation only through the press.

The collective is faced with the following task: Analyzing alternative options for the transition to the market economy and preparing recommendations for the Union government so that it can take them into account in its program which it is working on. A. Aganbegyan called the time allotted to this—until 15 August—unscientific and unjustified.

The deadline is explained by the fact that by 1 September a third government program should be prepared which will probably mention that many alternative proposals have been taken into account. The only question is whether it is possible to do this in practice in 15 days. In addition there is also the question of good will inasmuch as it has emerged that the commission has absolutely no guarantees that the recommendations it has elaborated will indeed be considered in the new government program.

It is true that N. Shmelev voiced the opinion that the situation in the economy is already so grave that the government simply cannot allow itself to dismiss sensible proposals. But even a simple enumeration of some of the projects which have arrived at the commission shows that it is in many cases a question not of something unexpected but of proposals which are well known to us the journalists, and to them the scientists, and, it must be supposed, to the USSR Council of Ministers apparatus. If no attention was paid to them before, what grounds do we have for believing they will be considered now?

I should not like to look like a pessimist, but how can we fail to recall the recent international competition for the best project for the ruble's convertibility? Both A. Aganbegyan and B. Milner were members of the jury which awarded six prizes to the winners, who included three Soviet citizens and three foreigners. And where now are these works containing specific proposals? B. Milner announced that they are being examined in the USSR Council of Ministers apparatus. But the competition ended over six weeks ago.

At the press conference it was repeatedly stressed that the commission was not created with a view to criticizing the government program but to issue constructive proposals. Workers of the Council of Ministers apparatus are present at its sittings and listen but do not say anything. It is true that a "whole" months still lies ahead.

Attempts To Circulate Hard Currency Viewed

PM2707095590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by V. Rastorguyev under the rubric "Topical": "The Ruble, Our Poor Relation"]

[Text] A big day has arrived for people who have a "stash" of dollars, franks, marks, or other real money even if only one or two hundred. S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has announced at a press conference that a resolution "On Improving Retail Trade and Providing Services for Foreign Currency on USSR Territory" has been adopted. The document will enter into force 1 August.

How in fact can wisdom be expressed? Probably by correcting in time an earlier mistake. Many people remember the extensive campaign to wipe out "Berezkas" [foreign currency shops] that caused a sensation more than two years ago. The existing hard currency trade, where payments are noncash and the range of goods is restricted, last year brought in only 38 million rubles [R]. A drop in the bucket. And this is at a time when there are more than R2.3 billion in freely convertible currency in the accounts of enterprises. Citizens have a more modest sum—200 million foreign currency rubles. But this will, of course, increase. Last year inheritances alone received by Soviet people from foreign relatives amounted to R30-35 million. The day is not far off when many of our fellow citizens will go to work abroad. It is clear that they will not be paid in rubles. It is simply senseless to lose potential hard currency and to force people and enterprises to spend their money abroad. Let them do this successfully at home. A network of trade outlets and own-brand stores where imported and Soviet high quality goods will be sold is being created for their benefit. Incidentally, it is proposed to repeal the compulsory declaration of the source by which hard currency was acquired when opening a hard currency account. We are today perhaps the only country in which this draconian measure exists. Not even China or Poland has it.

There is a reverse side to the government's decision. It yet again clearly demonstrates the weakness of the Soviet ruble. Of course, if you so wish, you can exchange it for another, more attractive currency. To this end it is proposed to organize currency exchanges. The exchange rate in these would be a market rate determined by supply and demand. At a recent currency auction the going rate was R30-34 per dollar. The first step is the hardest. Thus a pensioner dreaming of warm imported boots will be able to buy them by the end of the year. True, in the meantime he will have to go without bread and milk.

To be honest, the claim that this step brings the ruble nearer to convertibility within the country is unconvincing. Rather, it is a step toward the convertibility of the dollar. And not only the dollar. To be honest, the government decision is prompted by the country's difficult hard currency position. Finding itself up to its eyes in debt, the cabinet of ministers should in all honestly be in a debtor's jail. No, in fact you and I ought to be doing time. After all, so-called "convertibility" at a rate of one to 30 means that a student, for example, will have to live on...$1 a month.

July has been lavish with documents regarding foreign economic activity. They include the USSR president's decree "On Introducing Changes to the Soviet Union's Foreign Economic Practice." It remains only to welcome "the transition as of 1 January 1991 to settlements at world prices and in freely convertible currency in economic relations with the other members of CEMA" and the widening of cooperation with the developing countries which must be based "on the principles of mutual benefit and mutual interests," while "aid must be given with due regard for our country's real potential." Only who will play the leading roles in these important processes? Goods producers? No, all the appearances suggest that it will once again be ministries and other departments. But, as was absolutely correctly noted at the press conference, unless enterprises are dominant, there cannot be a market.

Talks Between Republics on Bank Reform Urged

PM2607133590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by R. Sergeyev under the "Finances" rubric: "War of the Banks"]

[Text] As is well known, on 13 July of this year the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution "On the RSFSR State Bank and Banks on the Republic's Territory." This step provoked a sharply negative reaction in the Union organs. The USSR Gosbank [State Bank] leadership cabled instructions 16 July to all bank institutions in the RSFSR not to carry out orders from republic banks if they contradict its own orders and to unconditionally fulfill the USSR Council of Ministers decisions.

Specialists at the country's Gosbank long ago prepared draft banking legislation envisaging the transformation of the banking system into a two-level system, with the Gosbank on the first level and banks working on commercial principles on the second level. However, these draft laws are stuck with the Union government.

Bearing in mind the dramatic situation as regards the money turnover question, the Baltic republics were the first to embark on the path of introducing a new banking system. Estonia simply rewrote and adopted as its own law the Union draft law on banks, merely replacing the word "USSR" with its own name.

Immediately after the adoption of the Declaration on RSFSR Sovereignty, the Union government started taking steps to defend its positions. A decision on reorganizing the USSR Bank for Housing and Municipal

Services and Social Development as a joint-stock commercial bank was urgently adopted. According to available information, analogous decisions are being prepared for the other specialized banks. These specialized banks will be transferred from all-Union ownership to "joint-stock" ownership and the republic will not be able to violate the rights of the shareholders.

On 16 July a telegram arrived at RSFSR banking institutions from the USSR Gosbank about the immediate transfer of all bank computer centers to the direct authority of the USSR Gosbank Main Computer Center.

Local banking institutions have found themselves in an extremely complex position. On the one hand, there is the legislative act adopted by the Russian Supreme Soviet, and on the other hand there are the orders and instructions from the USSR Gosbank administrations not to obey the republic law. A situation that is threatening to undermine the stability of the banking system has been created.

For the time being the RSFSR Gosbank has given the following instructions to Russian banking institutions: strictly obey existing rules for carrying out credit and settlement, emission, and other banking operations and prevent disruptions in services to the national economy and individual citizens.

What is the way out of the situation that has developed? I think that a presidential decree repealing the Russian parliament's decision would lead to a hopeless confrontation, particularly if you take into account the fact that the Ukraine has adopted decisions on the banking system similar to the Russian decision and other Union republics are preparing to adopt such decisions too. But delay is tantamount to death. Each day of confrontation, as the Lithuanian example has demonstrated, brings irreplaceable economic and political losses and damages the whole country's prestige in the world credit market.

Independent experts believe that it is necessary for Union republics, in the person of their Gosbanks, to immediately start talks on the future structure of the banking system since its general concept has already been prepared.

Foreign Group Praises Nuclear Waste Plant

LD2607135990 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeny Tkachenko]

[Text] Chelyabinsk July 26 TASS—"We have been impressed by the scope of production and the capacity of the radioactive waste vitrification facility that is now under construction," Professor Atsuyuki Suzuki, head of a delegation from the Japanese nuclear industrial forum, told a news conference on Wednesday after visiting the Mayak chemical complex, the firstling of the Soviet nuclear industry.

"Handling highly radioactive wastes is the most complex problem for the specialists in all countries that want to develop the nuclear power industry," he said.

"It would be great if we could address the problem with Soviet colleagues. We have been able to see an enterprise with rather high scientific and technical potential. It has gained experience and has promising elaborations," Suzuki said.

The Japanese nuclear scientists were the first from that country to gain access to the defence industry complex in southern Urals.

The Japanese guests toured the radioactive waste vitrification shop; familiarised themselves with how waste is treated, stored, and transported; and heard scientific reports on problems that are of interest to them.

The enterprise, any mention of which in the press or even in a private conversation was taboo, has now drawn up extensive conversion plans that are not concealed from the general public.

Four uranium-graphite reactors producting weapon-grade plutonium have already been shut down here over the past two years. The enterprise is developing its own technologies for application in various branches of the economy and medicine.

Multistory Housing Still Built Despite Drawbacks

PM2607150390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report by V. Kodkin and B. Vakulenko from the "Vremya"]

[Text] [Announcer] Providing every family with its own appartment by the year 2000—this rather unrealistic program is likely to run into further difficulties for reasons which you will learn from a report by our Irkutsk correspondent Vladimir Kodkin:

[Correspondent] This experimental poured-concrete apartment block in Irkutsk has been under construction for over a year. It has still not reached the second floor. The construction workers seem to be in no hurry, although they are well aware of the advantages of apartment blocks made from poured concrete. No house-building combines are needed for their construction, for instance. But the main point is that housing built by this method lasts practically forever. Which is not a claim that can be made for multistory blocks assembled from prefabricated panels.

We have virtually closed our eyes to an enormous problem which will loom large in the near future—the problem of having to rehouse millions of people from multistory housing built from prefabricated panels.

The need to develop poured-concrete housing construction and expand individual housing construction is more than obvious. However, in Irkutsk only an American

living locally has so far managed to build his own detached house. Meanwhile, the 30,000 inhabitants of Irkutsk who would like to build houses with their own money are being palmed off with promises.

Vladimir Vasilyevich, multistory housing continues to be built. Is anyone ever going to call a halt to this?

[V.V. Iskakov, Irkutsk Oblast chief architect] This is an inevitable process.

[Correspondent] You are the oblast's chief architect. What are you up to? Have you no say?

[Iskakov] It is not within my power to halt the construction of blocks from prefabricated panels. Architects are obliged to design housing in line with what our monopolistic contractor is capable of supplying.

[Correspondent] Is there no solution?

[Iskakov] The solution is the demonopolization of our contractor. That is to say, it is necessary to have a choice of contractors capable of building better houses and supplying a choice of housing.

Converted Defense Plant Boosts Civilian Output

LD2607114990 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Converted munitions plants in Moscow have been doing their best to increase consumer goods output. The chief of the press service of Russia's Federation of Independent Trade Unions, (Nikolay Okritov), said consumer goods production at defense sector plants had gone up by nearly 25 percent over the past three years. This year it is expected to increase by almost 23 percent. On the national scale about 400 industrial facilities are involved in conversion, manufacturing almost 1,000 items from prefabricated (?terra) cottages and electric appliances to children's toys.

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 18-25 July

LD2607014290

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 18-25 July. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

18 July
Even the old people can't remember a harvest like this one in the Kuban. Seven million tonnes of grain have been threshed since harvesting began in the fields of Krasnodar kray. Five and a half million tonnes are winter wheat. The average threshed from each hectare is more than 54 quintals. That's for wheat; the barley harvest is even greater. Harvesting continues in the Kuban, and the majority of farms plan to overfulfill their contracts for grain supply. (1300)

19-20 July
No significant developments reported.

21 July
By this morning 1.5 million tones of grain had been delivered to the elevators and grain reception centers by Stavropolye's crop growers. This grain consists mainly of strong and valuable wheat. Seven rayons have already coped with the state order. This year the kray's grain growers have grown an excellent harvest. The average grain yield per hectare has reached 35 quintals here. (0600)

Harvesting has started in Bashkiria. After three years of severe drought a plentiful harvest is ripening in the fields of the autonomous republic. According to specialists' assessments, it may be even more plentiful than in 1986. However, preparedness for the harvesting campaign is insufficient, alas. There is still a lot of unrepaired equipment at collective and state farms. There are not enough trucks to transport the new harvest to thrashing floors and elevators. (0600)

22-24 July
No significant developments reported.

25 July
Twenty-three million hectares in Kazakhstan are under the grain crops. To date the grain has been harvested and threshed from three million hectares. Harvesting is ending in Chimkentskaya and Dzhambulskaya oblasts, and is starting in Uralskya and Aktiubinskaya. (0900)

There are still problems with gasoline supplies during harvest in Kharkovskaya, Dnepropetrovskaya, Ulyanovskay, and many other oblasts of the Ukraine and the Russian Federation. As a result, cereals in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, for example, were gathered only on 2.2 million hectares over the last seven days. A total of 26 million tonnes of grains have been thrashed since the beginning of the harvest, but only 8 million have been handed over to the state. (1100)

Tashkent reports that according to the results of a primary check of the yield of cotton there, plants are developing ahead of schedule. This year, for the first time ever, half of the yield will be at the disposal of the farms. This will permit a significant profit which is needed for the improvement of socioeconomic standards of living in rural areas. (1100)

The first groups of city-dwellers left today for the state farms of North Kazakhstan. There is a great deamnd for machine operators in Kustanay and Kokchetav oblasts. Tselinograd Oblast alone needs 5,000 machine operators. Groups of city-dwellers will be engaged in preparing machinery. According to the agreements signed they will be paid 75 percent of their basic salaries in addition to their earnings at a farm. (1100)

In Stavropol Kray today, state and collective farms, having started sales of grain to the state, have already exceeded the state order. More than 1.9 million tonnes of grain have been delivered and now it comprises wheat of the strong varieties. (1300)

Grain and bean crops have been harvested on almost 20 million hectares and threshed on 17 million hectares. The harvest is lagging exactly one week behind last year's harvest. Conditions are difficult due to rain. The main difficulty for which ministries and departments are blamed is the shortage of fuel and spare parts. More than 40 million tonnes of grain have accumulated on the country's threshing floors. (1500)

'Vremya' Reports on Harvesting Progress

PM2607124590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report by by V. Glukhovtsev and V. Lazarevskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Now I would like to turn to an issue which concerns us all, the question of our daily bread in the most literal sense of the word. After all, the harvest has been under way in the country for quite a long time now.

In North Caucausus, the Kuban, Stavropol Kray, and the Don region the harvest is already drawing to a close. It is possible to claim that in many areas record yields have been achieved. In the Kuban yields of almost 56 quintals per hectare have been achieved. More than 8 million tonnes of grain have been harvested there. In the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as a whole yields are so far 10 percent, and in Kazakhstan four [announcer hesitates] quintals, above last year's levels. However, in themselves such reports are no cause for optimism if we remember how much grain we lose during harvesting, transportation, and processing.

Furthermore, state grain procurement—deliveries of grain to elevators—are lagging behind last year's figures. And that is beginning to cause alarm and fears.

Despite good yields, each region and each farm has its own problems. Take for instance the "Kara-Chok" sovkhoz [state farm] in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast in Kazakhstan.

[Correspondent] All grain-growing teams on the "Kara-Chok" sovkhoz are operating under the leasehold system for the second year running. Despite extreme drought, they have grown a good harvest on the mountain plateau. In Prokhor Kolchin's No. 2 team, where these shots were taken, wheat is yielding over 20 quintals per hectare. The team's best combine driver has threshed over 1,000 tonnes of grain against the season's norm of 340 tonnes.

The grain is large in size and plump with a high gluten content. The sovkhoz is hoping to sell the state more than 7,000 tonnes of wheat. As a result of the new purchase prices it will obtain more than 2 million rubles for this grain.

But here I must mention another problem. The area sown to grain on the sovkhoz totals 15,200 hectares, of which only around 6,000 hectares are occupied by wheat. The other land has been sown with barley. But you can see at a glance that the barley is thin and stunted in comparison with the wheat. Kazakhstan, where the summers are hot and dry, offers the country's most favorable conditions for growing strong, durum, and valuable wheats which are so urgently needed by the bread-baking and pasta industry. There is a chronic shortage of precisely these types of wheat.

However, in connection with the development of livestock raising, the republic is forced to cut back wheat sowings and expand feed crop sowings.

Grain Harvest Has 'More Than Enough Problems'

PM2707100190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Review by G. Yevstifeyev under the rubric "On Topics of the Day": "A Lot of Grain—Even More Problems"]

[Text] The harvesting toil is rapidly gathering momentum. Its center has now moved from the North Caucasus to the Volga region, the North Ukraine, the central Chernozem oblasts, and beyond the Urals. About 60 million tonnes of grain have already been obtained and as a whole the harvest promises to be quite good. On the 20 million hectares of grain fields which have been harvested the yield has been 30 quintals of grain per hectare.

But no one ventures to make a precise assessment of the anticipated grain harvest. Some cite a figure close to the record harvest of 1978 when over 230 million tonnes were harvested while others say approximately 10 million tonnes more than last year. And you have to understand the procurement workers. After all, a very great deal depends on the size of the 1990 harvest. And not only on the domestic but also on the foreign market. One thing is clear: A big grain harvest is on the way.

Unfortunately, as always there are more than enough problems. They include the usual trouble—the lodging and excessive wetness of the grain crops. And over large areas in Belorussia, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Non-Chernozem Zone, and the Ukraine. Some rayons in the South Ukraine, Moldavia, and in part Siberia and Central Kazakhstan have not avoided a drought.

But while the weather conditions are an objective cause there is nothing to justify the extremely low state of readiness of harvesting equipment for the toil. For instance, it has never before happened that in the RSFSR only 82 percent of grain harvesting combines have been ready for work by early July. The reason is not only the

overall shortage of spare parts but also the unreadiness of the agro-industrial complex and of industry for work on the basis of direct links.

The next problem is that piles of grain are growing on the kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] threshing floors. The grain must be shipped promptly to the elevators. As in previous years we cannot manage without bringing in motor transport from outside. But there is a shortage of vehicles. This has just been reported from Volgograd Oblast and the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. And after all, according to the communiques, everything should seemingly be normal. For instance, back on 11 July the Defense Ministry reported with military precision that of 5,000 trucks 2,500 were on the way, 1,000 had arrived, and 600 were being loaded. Everything shows that the preemptive maneuver involving motor transport did not succeed.

Complaints about the elevators' work have begun to come in. In Kalmykia again there is a shortage of storage capacities, while in neighboring Rostov Oblast they are refusing to accept grain: They say they have nowhere to put it. The obsession with size which has existed for many years is making itself felt. Because of this a "leg" for shipments by grain convoys reaches 100-150 km. The lack of good roads and the not always high-quality sealing of the truck bodies leads to grain losses which cancel out the saving from the cheaper cost of storage at large elevators.

This year it seems to me we are beginning to move away from requisitioning tendencies at grain elevators. But many farms are shipping grain to the elevators very slowly.

The reason is by no means that the kolkhozes and sovkhozes have now received greater independence. The grain shortage has always compelled farms to seek any opportunity to retain as much grain as possible for livestock feed. The question is how to make enterprises economically interested in selling grain to the state. The increased purchase price has only slightly reduced the disproportion between the price for meat and the price for grain. Instead of a ratio of 1:30 it is now 1:20, although in many countries it stays at the 1:7 level.

Soon the virgin land oblasts of Kazakhstan, where losses because of the shortage of people and harvesting and transport vehicles are most tangible, will join in the harvest. The situation here is alarming.. Batteries, pent-roof combustion chambers [naklonnyye kamery], bearings, variable-speed drives, and much else are in particularly short supply. Thousands of trucks are laid up because of the lack of spare parts and tires.

The features of the harvest are specific to each region of the country. But the problems are the same. The grain growers still depend on the administrative-edict system which by its sluggishness is reproducing these problems regularly and in abundance.

Mid-July Weather, Crop Conditions Reported

904B0264A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 25 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by N. Ignatova, agricultural meteorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Air temperatures are close to the annual average over a large portion of the USSR's territory.

The boundary for ripening of grains moved significantly northward. Over much of Belorussia and in Lithuania, southern Latvia, the northern half of the Central-Chernozem region, the southern half of the Central region, the Volga region (south of Kazan), and in the Ural region (south of Sverdlovsk) the winter crops were noted to have achieved gold ripeness, and south of the aforementioned territory full ripeness. The weight of the harvested grain is close to the annual average or a little higher. Moisture is also close to stipulated standards. In other regions the harvest of crops was complicated by rains and the grain was damp. To the north of the Riga-Smolensk-Kazan-Sverdlovsk line the winter wheat and rye were at the stage of milky ripeness. Development of winter crops was ahead of the annual average by seven to 12 days. In Belorussia and the Baltic, Central, and Northwestern regions conditions for the blooming and formation of grain were unfavorable for early spring grain crops because of cool, rainy weather. The acreage of downed crops increased.

Formation of panicles was noted over a large part of the zone for the production of corn for grain, and blooming of panicles and cobs began among the early-sowing and early-ripening varieties. After the rains which occurred, agricultural and meteorological conditions for the growth and development of corn in Stavropol Kray and in northern Rostov Oblast have improved somewhat. Formation of the grain of the corn began under conditions of a poor supply of moisture in the southern portion of Moldavia; in Odessa Oblast; over a large part of Zaporozhye Oblast; and in Kherson, Nikolayev, and Crimean Oblasts.

Warm, sunny weather and a relatively small number of days with precipitation over a large part of the zone of industrial cultivation of sunflowers favored the plant's flowering and pollination. The plant's height and the diameter of its flower head are a little greater than the average annual indicators. Maturation of the flower heads was noted in individual fields that were sown early in Kherson Oblast and Krasnodar Kray.

In the flax-producing zone the flax has for the most part achieved green ripeness. Growth of stalks has practically stopped. In the Ukraine and in southern Belorussia the flax has reached early yellow ripeness of the seeds. Individual farms have begun to harvest. In the Baltic region, Belorussia, and in Smolensk, Pskov, Novgorod,

and Kalinin Oblasts, cool, rainy weather was unfavorable for the completion of formation in fiber flax plants of a yield of fiber. The acreage of downed crops increased.

The potatoes continued to bloom. Conditions for the formation and growth of tubers remained satisfactory.

Hot weather predominated over the agricultural regions of Siberia and northeastern Kazakhstan. Winter grain crops in this zone ripened. Their harvest was conducted under favorable conditions. Spring wheat, barley, and oats formed ears; bloomed; and formed grain. Development of the early spring grain crops is ahead of the annual average by six to 12 days. Rains which fell over the majority of the regions improved the supply of moisture to the crops. However in Karaganda, Semipalatinsk, and Pavlodar Oblasts; in the steppe regions of Novosibirsk Oblast and Altay Kray; and in the majority of steppe and forest-steppe regions of Omsk Oblast, stores of usable moisture in the soil remained insufficient or poor.

The air temperature in the republics of Central Asia in the first half of this second ten-day period of July was a little lower than usual, but it increased later. On the average a single cotton plant formed one to two bolls, and in Surkhan-Darya, Kashka-Darya, and Kurgan-Tyube Oblasts and southern Turkmenia a single plant formed up to four bolls, which is close to the annual average number and a little higher than last year. Conditions for the development and accumulation of cotton bolls was favorable for the most part.

Gossnab Confers on Harvest Preparations

LD2707083890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] On 26 July a telephone conference was held in the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply]. It was given over to operational issues dealing with the provision of material and technical means for harvesting. Particular attention was paid to speeding up the supplies of fuel and lubrication oils; batteries and ball-bearings to kolkhozes and sovkhozes; and also metal for the Tula combine, Minsk tractor, and other works producing agricultural machinery.

Comrade Milashenko, deputy chairman of USSR Gosplan [as heard], drew the attention of the local suppliers to the need for strengthening direct contacts, business enterprise, and initiative for the issues could be tackled more successfully at a local level, in which case there would be no need to turn to the Moscow-based departments.

There were complaints from Tajikistan about the suppliers of gasoline from other republics. This incidence of local selfishness leads to machinery standing idle for long periods, and hence to the loss of crops.

A number of leaders of local Gossnab bodies and of the agro-industrial industry came in for criticism at the telephone conference for their lack of discipline. In particular, criticism was levelled at the comrades from Smolensk, Kiev, Kursk, and Voronezh. Mention was also made of the low standard of discipline among some suppliers.

The Gossnab telephone conference mapped out urgent steps to speed up harvesting. At the same time, very great attention was paid to the preparations for the rich harvest that is ripening in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan.

Transport Problems Bedevil Kuybyshev Harvest

PM2707100590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Report by L. Krechetova and V. Pavlov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A dramatic situation is emerging with the harvest in Kuybyshev Oblast.

[Reporter] [video shows grainfields, work of harvesting under way] We visited the "Ukrainskiy" sovkhoz [state farm] in Bolshechernigovskiy Rayon in response to an alarming event. The machine operators have come out on strike. And this at the height of the harvest. Many combines have actually been standing idle. But things have not come to a strike as yet. It is simply that the hoppers are full and there is nothing to transport the grain. The tractors have even been taken away from the feed fields. Milk tankers have even been sent to help transport the harvest. Nevertheless, there have been tremendous holdups. Only 24 of the 50 trucks which Kuybyshev enterprises, by agreement, are supposed to provide to the farms have arrived. The sovkhoz leaders are being rushed off their feet. The machine operators are actually threatening to riot.

[Z.B. Tuluzbayev, department chief] The crop is excellent, it is yielding 25-30 quintals. It is just lying there in the fields. It should be taken away. Look, the rayon party committee has turned its back on economic issues and is not resolving anything. It is the same with the rayon soviet executive committee—it is incapable of getting a grip on things either. The Komi Oblast Soviet Executive Committee is no different, if you ask me. At [word indistinct] the labor collective council has decided. We also have a labor collective council. And we will also decide that if the grain is not wanted, we will line up the tractors and the combines, we will line up everything in a row. Until they give us people and machines we will do this, and that is the way it will be because people here have had enough.

[Reporter] Formally, of course, everybody should do their own job. Workers should make the nuts and bolts and build machinery, and peasants should grow grain. Except that there are not enough machines to go round at the moment. A single combine here is having to cover

300 hectares—double the norm. Even so, they are forced to stand idle. A moral law has operated in Russia since time immemorial. At harvest time everyone would leave what they were doing and chip in. Because the grain cannot wait. The area under winter grain at the sovkhoz—one-third of its entire grain area—could have already been harvested if the city people had lent a hand. The situation is similar on most of the oblast's farms.

Scientific

Reportage on Efforts To Repair Hatch on 'Mir'

Problems With Space Walk

LD2607125490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1212 GMT on 26 July carries a 5-minute link-up with the flight control center. Special correspondents Vladimir Bezayev and Leonid Lazereyvich report that the "Mir" cosmonauts have already been working in open space for 57 minutes and 34 seconds.

Lazareyvich then goes on to recap the reasons for the space walk. "Well, they prepared for this walk and took out the television cameras and discovered that one of the bolts where the hatch closes had become unscrewed," he says.

He then remarks that the correspondents will shortly have a meeting with specialists who will explain how that had happened, whether it was a construction error, or if someone had not screwed the bolt in tightly enough.

"Well, having established that cause, the cosmonauts are moving to their place of work to carry out their main task," the correspondent continues.

Bezayev then says they were able to see the fault as it was shown on the mobile television cameras which the cosmonauts are working with. He says it is not just a matter of a loose bolt; one of the plates is deformed. He adds that it is possible that may have occurred during the last space walk and promises more information on the work in space in about five minutes. The cosmonauts' task this time is to gather the instruments and the ladder which they left there during the previous space walk so that they do not get in the way later.

Bezayev says the cosmonauts are, as it were, climbing down a tower "without a safety halyard" and with every little step they are looking for something to grip onto.

Bezayev says when the cosmonauts tried to close the hatch and looked at it from the inside no damage was visible. Aleksandr Balandin tried to close it several times but "the hatch just springs open, as if it is being thrown back," Bezayev says. He adds that specialists are at the moment deciding what is to be done and that the cosmonauts are in constant contact with the flight control center. He hopes that in the next link-up, it may be possible to hear the commentaries from the flight control center on how the work is proceeding and the voices of the cosmonauts.

Cosmonauts 'Behind Schedule'

LD2607145290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1305 GMT on 26 July carries a 10-minute live dispatch by special correspondents Vladimir Bezayev and Leonid Lazarevich from the flight control center that the "Mir" cosmonauts are now on their space walk. They are trying to fasten the two ladders. The last time they were outside they were in a hurry. Now one cosmonaut is fastening one ladder to the T module and the other is fastening the other. One did not succeed in folding away the straight ladder. The cosmonaut is heard saying in a recording that the ladder has sprung out. So, the correspondent says, the cosmonauts fasten it to the T module without folding it away. These ladders may still be needed during the space walk in the future but they are an obstacle to docking. A round ladder is needed to mend the craft's thermal insulation. Such walks around the craft were not envisaged so they had to use ladders. There are no rungs as on a chimney on Earth.

The reporters say the cosmonauts may try again to shut the hatch. At the flight control center hundreds of people are working on the problem. The lifetime of the hatch is not finished; it still has plenty of life left. "All will be clear when the council of experts gives the go-ahead for the closure or, on the other hand, the hatch is left open even for months." One expert specialist says that an attempt will be made to shut the hatch on this space walk.

The correspondent notes that at 1710 they should have the ladders done. It is now 1715 and work on the ladders continues, so they are behind schedule.

Cosmonauts' Space Walk Extended

LD2607145990

[Editorial report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1420 GMT on 26 July broadcasts a six-minute report by V. Bezyayev and L. Lazervich from the flight control center. The announcer says that the decision has been made to extend the space walk and to make an attempt to repair the transition hatch. The cosmonauts are heard reporting that they are near the hatch and are beginning the main work on it. The correspondents say that in 60-90 minutes, perhaps two hours from now, they will be able to report how this space walk has ended, what is awaiting the station, and perhaps what is awaiting the next crew. Vladimir Bezyayev reminds listeners that the cosmonauts have been in space for three hours, 10 minutes, and 25 seconds, and that their stay in space will be extended until 1900-1920 [1500-1520 GMT] when they are to return. If it takes longer they will nevertheless try to close the hatch. It is possible to work in open space for six hours.

Hatch Problem Determined

LD2607171990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 26 July in its "Vremya" newscast carries a three-minute report updating the situation on the "Mir" space station.

Announcer Igor Fesunenko reminds viewers that the two Soviet spacemen had been working in space since 1515

Moscow time, 1115 GMT. He then hands over to correspondent Sergey Slipchenko at flight control center.

Amid pictures of specialists at work, Slipchenko says that communications between the center and the "Mir" space station has been virtually continuous today. "The point is," he continues, "that the cosmonauts are now a long way beyond the range of the TV cameras. They have now lowered themselves to the spot at which the module is docked with the 'Mir' space station and they are now engaged in removing the handrails and this, as we reported yesterday on 'Vremya', is the priority task, or in fastening them down firmly so that they don't get in the way when the spaceship undocks or when the next expedition docks."

Slipchenko goes on to report that with the start of the latest EVA [extravehicular activity] "two hours ago," the cosmonauts had taken a TV camera out of the space station in order to film the faulty hatch and transmit the pictures to specialists on earth. "In fact, one of the hatch's structural features turned out to be damaged. Either it's a design fault, or it was done through misuse of the hatch. Time will tell which it is. But the main thing is that the problem has been identified." Slipchenko then explains, with the help of a diagram, that when the spacemen come back from their present operations, "they will make a further attempt to close the hatch."

Slipchenko concludes by saying that specialists at flight control center had just gathered the correspondents together "and announced that, even if the hatch remains open, it will not affect the further course of the space expedition." Foreign press reports to the contrary are groundless, he says. "The space program continues, and will continue for many years, as planned. All the international crews will work on board the 'Mir' space station." Slipchenko then signs off, promising a further report at an unspecified time.

Cosmonauts Close Hatch

LD2607162690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 26 July carries a five-minute report by correspondent Leonid Lazarevich from the flight control center. He says the news that the cosmonauts have shut the hatch was heard at 1846 Moscow time after they carried out a primary cosmetic repair. Now they are checking its pressure. First they inflated the compartment to 100 mm and right now they are trying to lift the pressure to 270 mm in order to see whether the hatch will withstand this and whether it has closed normally. Then they will take off their extravehicular activity [EVA] suits and leave. The hatch undoubtedly has a defect: One of the brackets is damaged. Evidently, future expeditions will still have to engage in extravehicular activity, change this bracket, and carry out repair work.

Mir Station Hatch Repaired

LD2607165790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 26 July carries a five-minute report from the flight control center by correspondents Besyayev and Lazarevich. The correspondents report that the cosmonauts have succeeded in shutting the hatch of the "Mir" spacecraft and received the order to remove their space suits. Pressure is normal. They were in open space for three hours and 31 minutes. Troubles with the hatch and ladder are recalled. The hatch is damaged and cannot be used.

Aleksandr Pavlovich Aleksandrov, cosmonaut and leader of the team responsible for all space walks, congratulates the crew.

The problem has been solved but the experts will be thinking about how to avoid a recurrence. The hatch had only been opened three times before. The hatch is the largest so far, a meter in diameter, but it can be delivered by "Progress-M". This is being considered, but a replacement of components may suffice. The fault may have been due to imperfectly equalized pressure. This must be rectified.

Activities Aboard Mir Viewed

LD2607215890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 26 July, in the framework of the "Vremya" newscast, carries a four-minute report introduced by Igor Fesunenko on activities aboard the Mir space station.

Fesunenko notes the interest of leading western agencies in the Soviet space program over the past week and that "in certain commentaries its expedience, its reliability, and its topicality are placed in doubt. The recent unsuccessful—as the western commentators write—walk by our cosmonauts in open space is adduced as an argument. As you know, one of the 'Mir' hatches was not closed and this, in the opinion of western specialists, supposedly demonstrates the ageing of the station." Fesunenko picks up his telephone receiver to ask the producer whether there is a line with correspondent Sergey Slipchenko at the flight control center, and then requests that Slipchenko be put on.

Slipchenko is seen in the flight control center in front of a large map of the world. "The cosmonauts spent three hours and 31 minutes in open space. Well, the results of today's work: The ladders at the hatch, which the cosmonauts left during the previous work, have been removed and fastened to places where they will now not impede the ship's docking. This was the first task of the walk.

"The second task—the hatch. The hatch, about which there was so much concern, has been closed. On Earth the situation was analyzed and it was worked out that it

was possible with great difficulty to close the hatch. Indeed, the cosmonauts applied very great efforts and closed the hatch."

Next, unclear images are shown on a large video screen. Slipchenko says that unfortunately we cannot see the hatch because the camera is reeling in a disorderly manner. Thereupon Slipchenko produces a still taken from the video clip which is supposed to represent the hatch.

"Now the cosmonauts are working under normal conditions. In the course of 24 hours the tightness of the module will be checked. Only then will the decision whether or not to open this module for normal activity by made."

In reply to the criticism of the western press, Slipchenko reads out information which has been announced today. "Of 520 experiments planned for this expedition, 506 have been carried out. Twenty-one million square kilometers of the earth's surface have been photographed with very great resolution—five to seven meters. These are unique, invaluable photographs for determining the ecological situation, not only for our country, but also in many countries of the planet. Foreign agencies and specialists are interested in these photographs. Twenty-three capsules with unique crystals will be sent down by this expedition. Well, I may say that protein crystals are being grown and western specialists—in particular American ones—assess one such crystal at a million dollars. Many such crystals will be grown on board. The next expedition will send down 90kg of cargo to the earth. A special 'Progress' ship with a launchable capsule will be sent off for the next expedition to do this."

At this point Slipchenko hands back to Fesunenko in the studio.

Future Work in Space Detailed

LD2707081990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 27 July broadcasts a three-and-one-half-minute recorded report from the flight control center by correspondent Vladimir Bezyayev.

Bezyayev begins by noting that 27 July is the cosmonauts' 167th day in space.

"Yesterday was a day of tension with another unscheduled space walk and some repair work," he notes, "but it proved possible to do the main thing: Finally to close the hatch." However, Bezyayev continues, "closing the hatch has not put an end to its problems."

The correspondent proceeds to interview Flight Director Vladimir Solovyev about the USSR's plans for further space exploration. "There will be new flights and new expeditions," Solovyev says. "A fresh crew is getting ready now which on 1 August will go and replace the crew consisting of Anatoliy Solovyev, who shares my surname, and Sasha Balandin. As for the hatch, that has to be sorted out, of course, since in the second space walk the cosmonauts had quite a hard job to close it, and they had to use various tools and bend structural components. Anyway, the hatch is shut and the air-tightness of the station is insured.

"I think that in the future the program will develop as planned. Expeditions will continue to fly to the 'Mir' space station. There is a Japanese crew in December. We plan to launch two cargo ships toward the station and to carry out all the scientific, technological, and other experiments. Apart from that, we will be thinking about how first we can make the construction of the hatch—the large hatch—a bit more reliable with a view to future stations, and second how to perform additional work—with the efforts of those on Earth and with the help of the cosmonauts—on this particular hatch. Perhaps even a special space walk will be planned to carry out the repair."

Solovyev goes on to explain what the present crew will be doing before they are relieved. There still are some "technological jobs" to be done using the furnaces. Photographic work also has to be completed. "We have a couple of cameras. One has high definition, but photographs small surfaces. The second takes panoramic shots." Finally, "on the 3 August, after the docking," the changeover period will begin and the present crew will brief their replacements, especially on the subject of the hatch. "They probably will spend more than one hour by that hatch," he says in conclusion.

'Cosmos-2087' Satellite Launched 25 Jul

LD2607143490 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 26 TASS—The Soviet Union launched the "Cosmos-2087" satellite with the "Molniya" booster rocket on Wednesday [25 July].

The satellite is equipped with space research hardware.

It was deployed on an orbit with the following parameters: —initial orbiting period 11 hours 49 minutes;

—maximum distance to the earth in apogee—39,342 kilometers;

—minimum distance to the earth in perigee—613 kilometers;

—orbital inclination—62.8 degrees.

In addition to scientific equipment, the satellite carries a radiosystem to measure its orbit and a radiotelemetry system to transmit data about the work of its instruments and research equipment.

The satellite's equipment is working normally. The Mission Control Center is processing information received from the satellite.

Military

Akhromeyev, Arbatov Interviewed on Military Threat

OW2507142890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2130 GMT 21 Jul 90

[Interviews with S.F. Akhromeyev, marshal of the Soviet Union, and Academician G.A. Arbatov by Sergey Yurakov; place and date not given; from the "Serving the Fatherland" program]

[Text] [Yurakov] Analyze, please, the chain of events connected with the failure of the spring Army call-up.

[Akhromeyev] Well, what do we have here? What chain can we talk about? We believe that in the given instance a very complex situation is being created for the Armed Forces. Indeed, we now in essence have six [word indistinct] republics that are openly opposing the conscription of young replacements into the Armed Forces. One Union republic, even two Union republics, have passed official laws for not sending young people to serve their time in the Soviet Armed Forces.

This has in fact all been done in direct violation of the Constitution. The Constitution stipulates that military service is the duty of each citizen of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. And this situation complicates the state of affairs. It degrades the combat preparedness of the Armed Forces, and I believe that measures should be taken by the highest organs of power. Measures should be taken in our country's Supreme Soviet to deal with this.

[Yurakov] What sort of measures?

[Akhromeyev] There is already a law: If a person refuses to fulfill his duties as a soldier, he is punishable under the law. I think the Supreme Soviet of the USSR could warn the corresponding Supreme Soviets of the Union republics of this, and from then on the law should be steadfastly observed.

[Yurakov] But that will lead to more tensions in our country.

[Akhromeyev] Well, I do not agree that this would lead to even greater tensions. If people see that authority is being exercised, that authority is being exercised to uphold the Constitution, for upholding the law, then I think the majority of our country's people would approve. And if the majority of the people would approve, I do not think that would raise tensions.

[Yurakov] What is the reason for the polemic that has been played out in the press between you and Academician Arbatov?

[Akhromeyev] I would just like to say right off that this polemic is not of a personal nature. I have known Academician Arbatov for many years and we know each other rather well.

In the present case, I think he and I have different views on the degree of danger our state faces, on how we should defend our independence, our independent foreign policy. In this case, in my opinion, Academician Arbatov underestimates the fact that in order for a state, such as the Soviet Union, to be independent even under the current conditions, it must have appropriate Armed Forces.

[Yurakov] In your view, what is the remaining level of military danger to our country?

[Akhromeyev] Could one say that there is no longer competition between the Soviet Union and the United States; between the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Pact today? I would not say so.

The United States still refuses to reduce, to conduct negotiations with us on reducing naval forces. They say there cannot be such negotiations because as a global power they need naval forces to defend their national interests.

The United States surrounded the Soviet Union with military bases at the beginning of the 1950's, and they still have not done away with them. [Akhromeyev points to a map] Please, take a look. Here is the ring of the U.S. military bases around the Soviet Union. More than 500,000 U.S. servicemen are stationed at these bases. There are naval vessels, military aviation. There are hundreds of such bases.

The United States is not reducing the number of its aircraft carrier strike groups. They have 15 of them. These aircraft carriers have up to 1,500 attack aircraft on board which can be deployed around the territory of the Soviet Union within eight to 10 days. [video cuts to Yurakov interviewing Arbatov]

[Arbatov] Well, you know, some military specialists say this, others say something else, but in general we need to take a much broader look at this issue, because it seems to me that we have first of all become wedged into a narrow understanding of security.

The likelihood of war has now been sharply reduced. I cannot imagine that the Americans want to conquer us badly enough to risk having even a couple of bombs, a couple of these nuclear missiles, dropped on their territory—not to mention the excessive quantity which we possess. And why conquer? In order to solve our economic problems? Or to inherit Nagorno-Karabakh?

Everything has changed, you know. We are threatened more by something else. Today we face a very serious economic threat. What will become of the country if there is famine? Will it survive politically? It will not survive that. How will we maintain a union, a federation, if the economy is ruined? We will not be able to do this. These things are new, so defense is no longer a sacred cow. It remains important for us but today, security means more than military defense, and various other

programs such as the health care program, the economic development program, and the education program compete with defense.

There should be a serious discussion, but our military specialists have become accustomed to speaking secretly and without opposition, so you cannot argue with them. You start arguing with them and they say: You cannot know that. So I ask: Why can't I know that? And they say: It is a secret. So, how can you argue with them? This was all wrapped in secrecy for so long and that is why stupid mistakes were made. They made the SS-20's, then they had to destroy them. They yelled to us at the time that we had parity, yet it turned out we had to destroy three times as many. Tanks were built, 64,000 tanks according to our own data, more than in the rest of the world combined. How was that possible? Who permitted this? [video cuts back to Yurakov interviewing Akhromeyev]

[Yurakov] If success is achieved at the Vienna talks, we will have to eliminate tens of thousands of tanks. Can you calculate how much that will cost? Who will answer for the damages?

[Akhromeyev] I think putting the question in terms of accountability is completely wrong. The heart of the matter is how the armed forces of the two sides developed historically and what tasks they were given. After World War II, when the Cold War unfolded, the situation between the Soviet Union and the United States, and later, between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, developed as follows: I need to refer to this map again. The United States and the NATO bloc primarily developed their naval forces and related components, and as I have already demonstrated, they surrounded the Soviet Union with these bases and their armed forces. They developed strategic aviation and posed a military threat to us.

We could not create an analogous military threat to the United States, which was located thousands of km across the oceans from us. And we could not deploy that sort of navy. We did not have the economy for it. Therefore, the development of our Armed Forces and....[Akhromeyev changes thought] The leadership of our state and of the Warsaw Pact then made a conscious decision to develop ground forces, primarily Armored Forces, in order to create a threat to NATO in Europe. [video cuts to Yurakov interviewing Arbatov]

[Yurakov] The fact is that national security also has a domestic aspect. The critical situation in this sphere can provoke the use of violent actions to pacify social upheavals. In that case, our country becomes a cause of international instability, in which case the West's attitude toward us will change entirely.

[Arbatov] There are several questions here. As far as the first question—military danger from within—I think it is incorrect. There is a question of the use of force internally, but that is not a matter for the Army. It is a matter for the internal troops and the militia. The Army is opposed, and rightfully so, to being used as a police force.

I think it is quite possible that we could become a source of instability if we try hard enough and do not carry out military reforms; if we drag our feet on reforms; if we consciously assist in the country's collapse. We could then become a source of instability. It will be dangerous with us having large quantities of tactical weapons and other types of dangerous weapons which could end up in who knows whose hands. I do not think we have the right; we have to exhaust all possibilities to prevent things from developing in this way. [video cuts to Akhromeyev]

[Akhromeyev] I would first of all like to express my disagreement with the assertion that the military threat to our country is growing. Yes, if we are to speak of internal political circumstances, then the situation here is becoming more aggravated. Unfortunately, it is becoming more aggravated.

This is connected first of all with the exacerbation of interethnic contradictions and with the actions of separatist forces, especially in the Baltic republics and frequently in the Caucasus republics as well. It is connected with the entry into the arena of political forces which previously did not exist. There are political forces that speak out against both the integrity of the country and our social structure.

The Armed Forces do not interfere in internal political processes. But if you speak of the integrity of the Soviet Union, the integrity of our state, they are of course required to defend it. They are the guarantors of this integrity. If you speak of the present time, when authority has been weakened, when political and economic ties between republics have been weakened and contradictions have increased, I think the Soviet Armed Forces are one of those forces which stabilize the situation and guarantee the integrity of our state.

[Yurakov] Can we depend on an army in which the social vulnerability of servicemen has recently been so clearly revealed?

[Akhromeyev] I think that servicemen understand and officers understand that such vulnerability is now characteristic of our entire people. We really have, that is, the entire Soviet people, all segments of our people—the workers, the peasants, the intelligentsia—they are all living in difficult circumstances. If a worker cannot get an apartment after decades and lives in difficult or terrible living conditions, then that is of equal concern to me as a patriot of my country. I am also hurt and upset by this.

[Yurakov] Everyone is aware of your polemic in the press with Academician Arbatov. But you also have a polemic going with the journal OGONEK.

[Akhromeyev] I believe that the journal is prejudiced against the Armed Forces and consciously defames the Armed Forces. That is, of course, a serious accusation. I make it with a sense of full responsibility for what I am saying. Secondly, I cannot forgive that journal for suggesting the possibility that there could be a military coup in the Soviet Union. This was an insult to the Armed Forces. That is completely out of the question in our country. The very nature of our Armed Forces, their mutual relations with the people, the education of our officer corps, and the education and training of our senior commanders completely rule out the probability of this. The likelihood of this has been knowingly put forth in order to defame the Armed Forces. [Video cuts to show Arbatov]

[Arbatov] We have begun discussing these problems for the first time. A kind of crossfire is taking place. It seems to me that this is very useful for the military. They, too, will see many things. They will see some weaknesses that they have and will somehow stumble over various new ideas. This is all beneficial to security. Of course they complain that the Army is being discredited. Well, being discredited is one thing, but when every critical word is perceived as discreditation, then everyone can complain. Of course it is unpleasant to find oneself suddenly in the sphere of criticism if for a long time you were outside of the sphere of criticism. But you must get used to this. In the long run this is of benefit to you, because it keeps you fit, so to speak, you are not remorseful or ill, but remain in real working condition.

And we must not be afraid of this and allow this to sidetrack us. There are difficulties and there will inevitably be more. There is a difficult past and we are making mistakes ourselves. Mistakes are inevitable but efforts must be made to make sure that these mistakes are not too big and that we quickly realize when a mistake has been made. We should not be stubborn but admit mistakes and quickly correct them. As far as this is concerned, if we take this course and implement these changes, there will be costs and difficulties. This is unavoidable, but this must lead us to success. And I believe that this is possible.

Continuing Need for CPSU Organs in Army Argued

PM2607143590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Lieutenant Colonel N. Yefimov under the rubric "Discussion Page No. 53": "Does the Army Need Ideology?"]

[Excerpt] Moscow—[passage omitted] Even today, following the 28th CPSU Congress decisions, people are continuing to make proposals on eliminating the institution of political organs. In my view, such a solution is irrational. There are undoubtedly many serious shortcomings in the activities of Army and Navy political workers. They are also largely to blame for the negative phenomena in military collectives which have undermined the Army's prestige in society.

But all this does not belittle the significance of the spiritual factor in maintaining the Armed Forces' combat capability. Under conditions of increasingly complex warfare and the troops' equipment with increasingly sophisticated arms, commanders inevitably become technocrats to a certain degree. And so they must have beside them specialists in interpersonal relationships who are competent in questions of sociology and psychology.

It seems that the renewed political organs will have a duty in giving servicemen political information, shaping legal culture, organizing leisure, ensuring the social protection of all categories of personnel, regulating interpersonal relationships, studying public opinion, and liaising with the public.

The creation of a multiparty system signifies the "deideologization" of educational work in the Army and Navy. But it certainly does not mean the "expulsion of ideology" or the disappearance of philosophical political ideas. It is a question of something else here—of rejecting social mythology and the denial of the priority of panhuman values and moral norms.

It is perfectly reasonable for the time being that CPSU organizations should continue operating in the Army, helping to consolidate servicemen on a platform of support for the policy of renewing and humanizing socialism. Of course, the activities of party structures and full-time workers must be financed exclusively out of the CPSU budget.

Life will show what things will be like later when noncommunist parties emerge into the arena of vigorous political activity.

However, it is already obvious today that the presence of members of different, rival parties—communists, social democrats, monarchists, liberal and Christian democrats, etc.—in military units and on board warships will hardly help to strengthen the cohesion of military collectives or to resolve the tasks facing us of maintaining combat readiness and performing combat duty.

There is still no answer to the question of how to keep the Army from the destructive influence of an interparty power struggle and how to prevent servicemen being drawn into internal political rivalry among various public forces. The Army must remain impartial except in the event of attempts to change the existing social system by unconstitutional means....

So as not to be caught unawares by the development of political events, our party is obliged to foresee in advance and "reckon up" the various possibilities of a change in the situation. There are no grounds for complacency and smugness. Times of trial are approaching.

Admiral Panin Interviewed on Naval Reforms

LD2707090390 Moscow TASS in English 0833 GMT 27 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow July 27—Reforms in the Soviet Navy entail changes in the personnel structure, the quality and quantity of munitions and equipment, and the duration of service, Admiral Vasiliy Panin said in an interview with TASS on the eve of Soviet Navy Day which is marked on the last Sunday in July every year.

Panin added that in tackling these problems the Soviet Union has to proceed from the realities of the current balance of naval forces and a prospective agreement with the United States on naval forces.

Panin recalled that NATO naval potential is three times greater than that of the Warsaw Pact naval forces in surface ships, more than twice as large in aircraft, and many times larger in aircraft carriers and landing ships.

The admiral stressed, however, that a purely mathematical approach in defining the parity of the two superpowers' military might is no longer the decisive factor.

"We have always proceeded from the assumption that seas and oceans do not separate but link countries and nations," Panin said.

The admiral described a modern navy as an intricate military mechanism reflecting the latest achievements of science and technology. It includes nuclear-powered strategic and mutipurpose submarines, surface ships for various purposes, anti-aircraft forces comprisng fighter aircraft and anti-aircraft gunnery, land- and sea-based aircraft, land-based missile artillery troops, and the marines.

The new defence doctrine and experience call for revising traditional views on sea-operations and battle action at sea, the Soviet admiral said.

Missile Installation Destruction Causes No Damage

PM2607141990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report by V. Batalov, V. Zhuravlev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Of late, reports about the elimination of missile launching installations have become commonplace. The Soviet Union faithfully honors its obligations under SALT II. But on occasion, the destruction of military installations does not proceed as smoothly as we might wish. "What Is the Cost of Rumors?" is the title of our correspondent's reportage:

[Correspondent] Evil rumors hit the small village of Borisovo, in the Novgorod Oblast forests. It was claimed that during the destruction of a missile launching installation, to be carried out in accordance with SALT II, houses in the village would be damaged and the village itself would sustain irreparable losses. After all, only just over 400 meters separated the village from the scene of the explosion. The villagers' concern was understandable. At a peasant rally it was decided to sound the alarm.

[B.V. Lebedev, chief of the combined unit political department] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Minister of Defense Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov addressed this problem personally. You might think: such a small village, only 25 houses. And yet the minister of defense deemed it possible to personally telephone the commander of the combined unit; experts were called in to explain the situation to the people; to persuade them, we even took people on helicopter rides to villages located at similar distances from military installations subject to destruction. But unfortunately, our arguments were not sufficient.

[Correspondent] The destruction of the missile launching installation was postponed. The original calculations were checked and rechecked. There were no errors. The explosion presented no danger to the village. This was reported to the minister of defense.

Then, on 18 July, the inhabitants of Borisovo heard a big bang and saw a big cloud rise above the forest. [video shows explosion]

[Unidentified villager] When we heard the explosion we rushed back and looked at the houses. Everything was fine, there was no damage.

[Correspondent] The destructive force of the rumors that had been started by someone had been greater than that of the powerful explosion. They had sown confusion and alarm in people's hearts, and above all they had instilled doubts as to the ability of Army specialists to guarantee safety and security during the operation.

Now all this is a matter of the past. But the peasants find it difficult to look the military in the face when they meet them. In my opinion, if anyone tried now to sow mistrust in the Army here, he would not have much success.

Baltic Republics

Gorbachev Criticizes Absence of Baltic Heads

LD2607211990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Reports from Latvia: According to the Latvian Supreme Soviet press center, Mikhail Gorbachev leveled severe criticism against the leaders of the Baltic republics who, disregarding personal invitations, did not attend the recent meeting of the Council of the Federation and of the Presidential Council in Moscow. Having stressed that there is no more important problem than the problem of the Baltic Republics, he described the situation as a crisis. Speaking about the mutual relations between the center and the republics, he noted that it is essential to create structures on which the president can base himself.

The participation of the chairmen of the Supreme Councils of the Baltic republics in the meeting of the Council of the Federation and the Presidential Council which examined a Union treaty, could be interpreted as giving up the status of independence, explained the deputy chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, Andrejs Krastins, who took part in the 20 July meeting as an observer: We are for negotiations with Moscow, for negotiations on the restoration of independence, but not on a Union treaty.

According to Krastins, the Baltic states must, above all, aim at direct economic and political contacts with the Soviet Union's republics. The vice chairman stated that Mikhail Gorbachev listed eight [as heard] points which must be consolidated in a Union treaty as the competence of the center. They are: defense; control of the borders; safeguarding state security; safeguarding the legal status of personal freedom; establishment of a Union institute eliminating interethnic conflicts; coordination of market relations; establishment of a joint currency system, prices and standards; supply of power to all republics; coordination of all types of transport; safeguarding information on the progress in science and technology; safeguarding international political relations, foreign trade and customs; coordination of the ecological system; and establishment of services for the joint struggle against natural calamities and technological accidents.

The only person who basically opposed these positions was Eduard Shevardnadze. According to Krastins, he stated that he was fearful as regards the Union treaty and, above all, it was essential to talk at the highest level with each republic separately.

Yeltsin Holds Talks With Latvian Officials

Discuss Cooperation Treaty

LD2707072490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] Talks between Latvian Supreme Council Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin on the conceptual formulations of the mutual cooperation treaty between both republics and the treaty's political details took place in Jurmala yesterday. Recognition of Latvian independence must certainly be included in the first, political part of the treaty, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin said during the talks.

In the course of the talks, Anatolijs Gorbunovs described the situation in Latvia. According to the chairman of our Supreme Council, the internal political situation is complicated. It is being destabilized by insecurity in the economy.

Both sides in the talks expressed a negative assessment of the present attitude of the USSR Government towards independence endeavors by the republics.

Supreme Council deputy chairmen and other official persons participated in the talks on the the Latvian side.

'Resting' in Latvia

LD2607212790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, who is resting in Jurmala, appears as though testing his physical endurance. Almost every day he walks 10 km on the beach, swims in the swimming pool, and plays tennis. Disregarding the advice of physicians to live quietly for at least two months after a spinal operation, he remains on the tennis court for two to three hours a day. His wife (Nayna Iosipovna) is very concerned about this. Apart from being engaged in sport, he is meeting people and signing autographs. On the whole he does not behave in a very disciplined manner, of course, from the point of view of his bodyguards.

As he has stated himself, however, his arrival in Lativa has political implications. Boris Yeltsin has more than once met the leaders of the republic, and examined urgent problems relating to a treaty on mutual relations between Russia and Latvia. According to the Russian leader, these talks were taking place in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.

Latvian 27 Jul Supreme Council Session Relayed

Penal Code, TU Property Discussed

LD2707080490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0645 GMT on 27 July is monitored in progress carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 0646 GMT, debates are under way concerning a draft law on amendments to the penal code. A vote is held and the draft law is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0654 GMT, Deputy Rasimavicius takes the floor and presents a report on a draft law concerning trade union

property. Debates took place. Different opinions are expressed about the nationalization of the property of former trade unions.

At 0711 GMT, by a majority of votes, it is decided to have preliminary discussions on this item on the agenda.

At 0714 GMT, debates continue. Some deputies express the opinion that former trade unions are state organizations and therefore their property belongs to the state. The state does not nationalize its own property, therefore, new trade unions which will be formed in Lithuania cannot automatically take over this property.

At 0743 GMT, the debates on trade union property conclude. A break is announced until 0845 GMT.

Relay 'Requested by Deputies'

LD2707110390

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0815 GMT on 27 July begins to broadcast a live relay of the Latvian Supreme Council session in Riga.

Reporter Anta Busa says that this relay has been requested by deputies because of the importance of land reform discussion. She also mentions that Jurkans in the United States yesterday had held a telephone conversation with the White House and, unofficially, it was known that Godmanis and Jurkans would, after all, meet Bush. The meeting is envisaged for 30 July, Busa reports.

At 0817 GMT, Gorbunovs, chairing the session, opens the proceedings on land reform (after a break which has just ended).

After a procedural introduction by Gorbunovs, at 0819 GMT a count of deputies shows 125 present.

At 0821 GMT, Strikis presents the agricultural commission's report on land reform draft law, in conclusion suggesting that all proposals concerning the bill be presented by 15 September.

At 0845 GMT, (?Pelsis) adds more details about the commission's work.

At 0851 GMT, Lagzdins has a question concerning Lithuanian agrarian reform and suggests that this should be tackled first. It is stated in reply that the agrarian reform was tackled as a whole here, but the land reform has become that urgent that it could not be delayed any longer.

At 0853 GMT, Bresis asks about financing of the reform.

At 0855 GMT, further questions are asked by Brinke, Safonov (in Russian), Salitis, (?Vaivods), Zaletayev (in Russian), Kodolins, Zatuliviter (in Russian), Rogal (in Russian), Martins Berzins (asks whether the military would also request land, mentioning the situation in Saldus rayon). The questions are answered by commission and working group members; a reply concerning publication of laws is also provided by Gorbunovs.

At 0905 GMT, the debate begins with Zaskerinskis as the first speaker.

The debate continues with Udris, Zatuliviter (in Russian), Zeile, Bukele, Stroganov (in Russian), Brinke, Slakota, Bresis (mentioning matters of principle which should be solved e.g., denationalization, the cost of establishing peasant farms), Blazevics, Gabranovs, Kinne, Lucans, (Bekasov) (in Russian), Razna, Ziedins (mentioning, to start with, that those who do not wish the rural areas well are not present in the hall) and Smoluk (in Russian).

At 1030 GMT, there are procedural questions and Viktors Alksnis is rebuked by Gorbunovs for using a procedural question to deceitfully have his say about a different matter.

At 1032 GMT, the sitting is adjourned for lunch until 1200 GMT.

Lithuanian 26 Jul Supreme Council Session Relayed

LD2607173190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 26 July resumes its broadcast of a live relay of the plenary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius. The adoption of the draft law on prices by paragraph is in progress.

At 1430 GMT, debates on each paragraph of the above draft are followed by voting.

At 1435 GMT, a vote is taken on the entire draft Law on Prices of the Republic of Lithuania. There are 96 deputies in favor, with no one voting against. Three deputies abstain. The law is adopted. A decision concerning the date for the law on prices coming into force is adopted.

At 1438 GMT, the next item on the agenda, a decision on the draft program of economic reform, is discussed.

At 1443 GMT, deputies debate the date for the deadline by which the government should present a program of economic reform.

At 1447 GMT, a vote taken on the entire draft law on the decision on the program of economic reform. It is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 1459 GMT, the draft law on joint-stock companies comes under discussion.

At 1500 GMT, debates on a draft law of joint stock companies are in progress.

At 1522 GMT, various questions are raised about the draft law.

At 1530 GMT, an interval until 1600 GMT is announced.

At 1600 GMT, the session resumes its work. Debates on the draft law on joint stock companies continue.

At 1613 GMT, the minister of industry, Jasinevicius, proposes minor amendments to individual articles in the law.

At 1619 GMT, Matulevicius, representative of the association of industrialists, proposes several amendments to the draft law.

At 1627 GMT, the voting on individual articles of the draft law is postponed until alternative and amended articles are submitted.

At 1631 GMT, a draft procuracy law is submitted for debates. Amendments to individual articles are described.

At 1646 GMT, debates on the draft law are in progress.

At 1654 GMT, a proposal is made not to adopt the law today, but vote only after amendments to the provisional basic law are introduced.

At 1656 GMT, the deputies support the draft law in the first reading, and decide to take a vote tomorrow when amendments to the provisional basic law are introduced.

At 1700 GMT, the deputies decide by a majority of votes to conclude today's proceedings. The session will resume its work tomorrow at 0700 GMT.

Lithuanian, Soviet Foreign Ministry Delegates Meet

LD2607180690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1539 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] A meeting of delegations of the Foreign Ministries of the Soviet Union and Lithuania has taken place in Moscow. It was attended by Lithuanian deputy foreign ministers Katkus and Griezas, and heads of departments. The USSR Foreign Ministry was represented by Deputy Minister Komplektov, the head of the directorate, Vasev, heads of departments, and experts.

This meeting was a consultative discussion and within the preparations for the interstate negotiations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. During the discussions problems submitted by the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry on the establishment of Lithuanian interests bureaus abroad and of foreign bureaus in Lithuania were discussed. The problems of the status of the republic borders, the possibilities of establishing the Kalvarija border checkpoint, and of opening the Lazdijai border checkpoint to the citizens of all countries were discussed. Discussions took place on opening an international airport in Vilnius, liberalizing the issue of visas to Lithuania, and on mutually coordinating these questions.

Views were exchanged on future negotiations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

Prunskiene Addresses Seminar in Finland

90UN2378C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 3 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by R. Chesna: "Meetings in Finland"]

[Text] Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, returned from Helsinki on 2 July after taking part in an interstate seminar called "The New Hanseatic League—the Restoration of East Europe" in the Finnish city of Kotka.

The prime minister told an ELTA correspondent that last Saturday after she arrived in Finland from Tallinn she gave a report in Kotka during the afternoon part of the seminar and briefly acquainted the audience with the general situation in Lithuania, its problems, and its interests.

On Sunday during the second part of the seminar, where prospects for a new political and economic cooperation of European states was discussed, Kazimiera Prunskiene gave a long report and later took part in a general discussion. Discussed in particular was the creation of common communication and transportation systems and opportunities for using the port of Klaipeda.

Documents sent from Tallinn by the chairmen of the supreme soviets of the three Baltic states with a request that the Nordic Council accept them for membership with the status of observers were also discussed in the meetings in Kotka. The leaders of the Nordic Council and politicians maintain, as Kazimiera Prunskiene noted, that the council's jurisdiction is not adequate to the task and it does not interfere in foreign policy related to the recognition of states. That is a matter for governments.

Questions concerning aid for Lithuania were discussed at the meeting.

Vilnius District Guarantees Minorities' Rights

LD2607210290 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius July 26 TASS—"Equal political, economic and social rights and freedoms are guaranteed to the local indigenous Polish population just as to all other citizens of the Lithuanian Republic," reads the key provision of the "Vilnius Polish National District Status," which was endorsed at a session of the district soviet today.

It specifies that on the territory of the district "the Polish language is equal to the state language and the Russian language is the language of inter-ethnic communication. [no quotation mark as received]

The document envisages "developing the network of pre-school establishments and general schools for the Polish population, as well as amateur artistic work in the native tongue".

The document stipulates that "pivotal issues of the district's political, social, economic and cultural activity are put to discussion and, if need be, are solved by a local referendum. A local referendum is announced by the district Soviet of People's Deputies on its initiative or on the demand of 10,000 residents of the district, who are eligible to vote".

The document is mindful of the interests of other ethnic groups residing on its territory, to whom "free development, the respectful attitude to their culture, customs and language are guaranteed." To ensure and protect their lawful rights, the district soviet set up a council of the representatives of national minorities.

The district soviet reminded once again the republican Supreme Soviet and government that, despite residents' repeated requests and applies, [as received] the question of "opening a higher school to train in the Polish language specialists in agriculture and also teachers of various subjects for Polish schools" was not solved.

The session of the district soviet elected three representatives of the Vilnius Polish national district to be included in the delegation of the Lithuanian Republic at the forthcoming talks with the delegation of the Soviet Union.

Estonia Sends Note to USSR Government

PM2607160890 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jul 90 First Edition p 1

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Semenyaka 26 July report from Tallinn under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Estonian Foreign Ministry Note"]

[Text] The press here has reported that the Estonian Foreign Ministry has conveyed a note from the republic government to the USSR Government.

What was the reason for this act, which is, after all, unusual in the relations between a Union republic and the center? In the Estonian government's opinion the reason is, first, the complex domestic political situation, and, second, "recent events, as manifested in repeated movements of troop units without prior coordination... the participation of servicemen in mass political events..."

In this connection it is proposed to hold a working conference, with a view to drawing up proposals on the principles and procedure for the legislative definition of the status of the USSR Armed Forces on Estonian territory, with the participation of plenipotentiary representatives of the USSR Government, the USSR Defense Ministry, and the governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

It was also stated that it is necessary to begin talks to settle this entire range of questions and to set up an institute of plenipotentiary representatives of the governments of the Baltic republics with the rank of ministers attached to the USSR Defense Ministry and observers attached to the Baltic Military District Military Council.

This institute is charged with the following tasks, among others:

—informing the republic government of planned large-scale military exercises and maneuvers, movements of troops and equipment, and unusual occurrences in military units;

—participating in the formulation of organizational measures in emergencies (natural disasters, major accidents, and so forth);

—formulating proposals on ensuring living and domestic conditions for servicemen and their families in the republic's territory;

—jointly resolving questions of the drafting of young people for effective compulsory service by draftees from the republic in accordance with the laws adopted by its Supreme Soviet.

It is clearly a question of serious problems, in principle. The only thing that is not clear is, why try to resolve them in the language of notes?

Estonian Anti-Army Sentiment Viewed

90UN2395A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 18 Jul 90 pp 1, 2

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Tarakanov: "Instigators and Deserters—Who Is Stirring Up Anti-Army Hysteria in Estonia?"]

[Text] Tallinn—*A powerful explosion broke the silence. The track wheel of the tank which was mounted on the pedestal at the entrance to the Estonian city of Valga flew off far to the side, but the "thirty-four" remained in its place. As the military commissar for the Valga District, A. Veselov, said, the experts' opinion is that an old German aircraft bomb had been used to demolish the heavy machine.*

This explosion was one more act in the powerful campaign being waged in Estonia against everything in any way connected with the past and present of the Soviet Army.

Some 10.2 percent of the cooked sausage, 29.5 percent of the frankfurters, 48.5 percent of the canned milk, 88.9 percent of the seafood delicacies... No, dear reader, this

is not a printing error which has caused the material from one article to end up in another. These are the percentages of the overall volumes of food products allotted to Tallinn stores that are consumed by disabled veterans of the Great Patriotic War. There are heroes of the Soviet Union, platoons of soldiers, Afghan war veterans, and several other categories of beneficiaries. These figures which, in my opinion, are shameful, represent what the Tallinn City Soviet had to take away from the people who deserved their attention. The usual applications for out-of-turn service for veterans of the Great Patriotic War disappeared from the stores. But more and more voices are being heard calling for manna from heaven to be strewn on the heads of veterans of the 20th Supreme Soviet Division. This, for example, is what EESTI EKSPRESS, which calls itself an independent newspaper, writes on 9 March of this year: "...and if misfortune ever befalls Estonia and her people, the German people are always ready to extend a helping hand."

"The agreement signed by thousands of Estonian youth ends with these words. Germany and the German people will soon regain their borders. We hope that when we gain our freedom, the struggle against our common enemy will not be forgotten. The old people in Estonia are waiting for their military pensions."

The article cited above discusses one of the former SS members who was trying to take a bite of the FRG pension pie. He was shown the door after being told that pensions are paid but not to former military servicemen who were residents of occupied territories. True, the author of this article regarded the response as "inspiring hope in the future"—he probably had in mind the present situation in Estonia. It does not seem to me that the bureaucrats in the FRG military department have any intention of paying for the sins of Hitler, who trampled on international law and particularly on the appendix to the Fourth Hague Convention of 1907 concerning laws and customs of infantry forces. This legal act points out the inadmissibility of enlisting the population of occupied territories in military operations and defense jobs.

Here we have arrived at one of the most crucial problems around which swords have clashed for almost two years, and the duel has now moved inside the walls of the republic parliament. This is the problem of Estonia's legal situation and the dilemma related to it: Whether or not Estonian youth should serve in the Soviet Army. This is why the aforementioned Hague document and the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 have become handbooks for the parliamentarians. Its 51st Article states that the occupying power does not have the right to force individuals on the territory it has conquered to serve in its armed or auxiliary forces. This article was the "legal" basis for the Geneva-49 movement which originated on 30 October of last year. Its initiators were activists of the Christian Democratic Union, the Society for the Protection of Monuments of Antiquity, the People's Front, the National Independence Party, the "Greens," and several other small groups. The logic of their ideas was this: Since in 1940 the USSR forcibly occupied the independent and autonomous Estonian Republic, it must therefore support the Estonian youths who refuse to serve in the Soviet Army. The mechanics are simple: A young chap comes to the committee, most frequently accompanied by parents or friends, and says that he does not wish to serve in the Army. They take his draft card from him and ask him to fill out a form and three copies declaring his refusal to serve and addressed to the USSR Ministry of Defense. The military document and one copy are sent to the republic military commissariat, the second remains with the draftee, and the committee keeps the third.

This committee and its local representatives are working by the sweat of their brow. The number of people refusing to serve is increasing not by the day but by the hour. Geneva-49 and its proponents in various social organizations boldly refuse to let their passions cool. Typical in this respect was the "anti-military" rally in Ratushnaya Square in Tallinn. Emotions grew to extremes. The epicenter of the rally's force was one T. Khallik. With a tiny baby in her arms she gave an impassioned speech calling for Estonian mothers not to let their sons go into the service of the "occupiers." One must understand that the baby was a symbol of these sons, although the "threat" of his ending up in a military uniform was fairly remote. The real threat was pneumonia: There was a drenching cold rain that day.

On the eve of the rally in the newspaper VECHERNIY TALLINN there was an article by Liym, one of the leaders of Geneva-49, in which he suggested regarding as occupiers not only the military servicemen and reservists but also the entire "large civilian garrison that followed the Army in." As they say, is this not what this is all about? Be that as it may, there are plenty of gullible chaps being taken in by the "Geneva people." And it is especially alarming for those who have deserted. There are 57 of them in the republic. One of them, A. Sostalu, was arrested and is under investigation.

This is what the military prosecutor, Colonel A. Gladilin of the judicial corps, had to say about this:

"Civilian officials should think twice before calling for military servicemen to go absent without leave—there is no point in subjecting their compatriots, brothers, and sons to the threat of punishment. It would be much kinder to convey to them through the mass media how dangerous and illegal such actions are..."

Geneva-49 goes far beyond what is allowable for a social organization and interferes with government organs, and the "legal" basis for their actions is questionable, to put it mildly, since for some reason their functionaries forget that in the convention in addition to Article 51 there is the Article 6 where it clearly states: "The applicability of the convention on the territory of the sides that are in conflict ceases after the general termination of military activities."

Well, God be with the Geneva-49! It is much more difficult to understand many city and district soviets which hastily adopted a decision concerning refusing to serve in the ranks of the Soviet Army.

The anti-Army hysteria—I am not afraid to use that word—has a negative effect on the mutual understanding between the local population and the military servicemen. It is no accident that the previous Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia this winter were forced to appeal to the residents of the republic to be tolerant of the enlisted men and officers of the Soviet Army.

A sober evaluation. It would seem that the concrete actions should also be sober. But, unfortunately, this is not always the case. On the one hand, when meeting with K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy minister of defense, it was requested that point two of the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers on calling citizens up for active military service not apply to the Estonian SSR but that its citizens be given the opportunity to volunteer. As an experiment they could do labor service as an alternative to active duty in the USSR Armed Forces. Physically or psychologically wounded military servicemen should be granted the opportunity to finish out their terms in military units located on the territory of the republic and several of these units should be manned by recruits from Estonia.

On the other hand the first session of the republic Supreme Soviet of the first convocation adopted the decree "On the State Status of Estonia," which asserts that "the occupation of the Estonian Republic by the USSR on 17 June 1940 did not halt the existence of the Estonian Republic de jure: The territory of the Estonian Republic has been occupied up to the present day."

And in the decree of the Supreme Soviet "On a Historical-Legal Evaluation of the Events in Estonia in 1940," it says that foreign economic and military acts taken by the Stalinist leadership of the Soviet Union against the Estonian Republic in 1940 are regarded as aggression, military occupation, and annexation of the Estonian Republic. The elections to the State Duma of the Estonian Republic on 15 and 15 July 1940 are considered to have been conducted in violation of the Basic Law of the Estonian Republic and the law on elections, and the parliament formed this way was invalid and not authorized to make decisions changing the state status of Estonia. The Supreme Soviet draws the conclusion that the inclusion of Estonia in the Soviet Union in 1940 was wrong and recognizes the decision of the State Duma of Estonia of 22 July 1940—"Declaration of the Entry of Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics"—as legally invalid since it is not based on the free expression of the will of the Estonian people.

Hence it naturally follows that our army is an occupation army and it is not mandatory to serve in it. This is the reference from which the republic Supreme Soviet proceeded on 11 April when adopting the law on the service of Estonian SSR residents in the USSR Armed Forces.

All the Union normative acts pertaining to universal military obligation were declared illegal on the territory of Estonia. Articles of the republic criminal code that envision punishment for evasion of military service are abolished and individuals convicted under these acts are rehabilitated. Institutions and organizations are ordered to halt work for recruitment into the Army and they are also forbidden to demand military documents upon registration.

In the military encyclopedic dictionary "occupation" is interpreted as a temporary occupation of enemy territory by the armed forces and the assumption of control over it. Personally, I do not find these indicators in relations between the Estonian Republic and the USSR, nor did the group of deputies who disputed their status and their law on the service.

Can draft evaders and deserters feel safe from now on while legal guarantees remain reliable for other youths? I do not think so. In the first place, the legal act that was adopted contradicts the USSR Constitution and the law on universal military obligation. In the second place, the transition period declared by the Supreme Soviet, which it intends to end "with the formation of constitutional organs of state power of the Estonian Republic," is not only an unconstitutional phenomenon but it is also difficult to predict. And thus: "Every person must be well aware of what he is risking personally. In general it is risky to serve in the army but it is also risky to evade the service: One can be subjected to repressive measures. There is also a risk for the Supreme Soviet since it is not known whether the laws it adopts will be recognized. So far it is impossible to guarantee immunity for anyone. Today people frequently ask the question about guarantees, but the transition period per se includes very few guarantees of any kind. This is its specific nature: There is a political struggle going on and its outcome is unclear."

Common sense. But here is the rub—does the chairman of the permanent commission of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet for state defense, R. Tamme, have it? This is the commission that should mainly ensure the legality of norm setting in military matters. Has it not responded to inflamed public opinion in submitting to parliament a draft law which it knows to contain a constitutional conflict?

An alarming situation has developed today. The bitter attack on the Soviet Army, the politicization of military servicemen, and the revolt in the minds of recruits—these are still not all the components. Add to this the spreading of the wings of the eagle with the sword in its talons—the symbol of the Estonian Defense Union. Today there are about 1,400 people in its ranks. Its founder, K. Eller, in a recent interview with a correspondent of the ESTONIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY,

declared that the Defense Union "sees the goal of its activity primarily in being prepared to protect the citizens and develop skills for protecting the homeland. And only after that comes the protection of the residents of Estonia and their property." "Such a mass organization as the Defense Union cannot put police functions at the top of its list," he said.

Against whom does the Defense Union intend to defend the homeland?

There is the opinion that when the people do not want to feed their army they will be feeding someone else's. Let us ask the question: To whom is it advantageous to consider the Soviet Army someone else's?

RSFSR

First Deputy Chairman Khasbulatov Interviewed

90UN2391A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 18 Jul 90 p 1

[Report on interview with R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, by S. Kredov, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA parliamentary observer; place and date not given: "Shortage of Laws, Not of Slogans, Disturbs R.I. Khasbulatov"]

[Text] The office of R.I. Khasbulatov (by no means austere in the scheme of the former republic authority) has a certain similarity to a headquarters. A substantial part of the visitors enter here in a casual way, and without an appointment. The secretary is natural and courteous: It seems she also feels privy to events that are new for the country... I cannot help noting that the chief of the office himself has not yet learned to cope with the dozen or so white telephones arranged to his right: When the phone rings, one looks inquisitively to see who is disturbing him. I do not rule out that part of them are now silent... I turn the reader's attention to these details inasmuch as they also intrigued me—somehow a new authority has been set up in the baroque apartments of the former authority.

This is my second interview with Ruslan Imranovich since he was elected. I reach the conclusion that an interview with him is easy for a journalist. He is thorough and proper. He answers exactly those questions that are put to him, and—as often happens with politicians—he does not mouth speeches prepared in advance by aides, and which are therefore boring. I begin the interview with the proposition that the absence of a quorum at the last meeting of the session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet blurred the overall picture somewhat.

"Blurred? No, I would not agree with this," Ruslan Imranovich said. "The planned strategic decisions, nonetheless, were adopted. However, the absence of part of the deputies for a discussion of this question specifically—about the mechanism of the sovereignty of the people in the RSFSR—I do not think is incidental. The text of the draft resolution clearly stated: Chairmen of soviets of people's deputies at all levels that combine this position with any other must make up their minds; otherwise their authority as chairmen will be abrogated by higher soviets. Some party and administrative workers are clearly not hurrying to leave their managerial chairs. They are waiting to see how things will turn out. Although, in my estimation, the opinion of an overwhelming majority of the members of the Supreme Soviet coincides with those that were declared at the congress.

[Kredov] What decisions do you classify as strategic?

[Khasbulatov] For example, there was an announcement about a complete transfer of the banking system to the control of the Russian state, and about the establishment of a state republic bank. As a professional economist, I will single out the fundamental decisions in the economic sphere, which developed the aims of the congress in achieving the sovereignty of the Russian Federation. Independence is not achieved just through political declarations.

[Kredov] I have already had occasion in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA to quote the words of a famous academician who called the Declaration of RSFSR Sovereignty "a literary work," and no more than that.

[Khasbulatov] Well, he is right in many ways. If words are not materialized into laws, the declaration then remains not a very perfect literary work. Realizing this, the Supreme Soviet adopted a number of important decisions. For example, the Law on Property on the Territory of the RSFSR prohibited any kind of transformations of forms of property without the sanction of republic authorities. This is a necessary measure, inasmuch as attempts are being made to turn the ministerial structure into the likeness of joint-stock companies, consortiums, associations, and so forth, thereby "dissolving" a part of the property of Russia. Henceforth, they are illegal. Further, the entire foreign economic sphere comes under the control of the Russian state. Pertinent normative acts have been adopted (fully or in the first reading). I will also note a very important decree concerning the conversion of six oblasts and cities into free enterprise zones. This idea has been discussed for several years, and I myself did economic studies, but the matter got no farther than words... So that we are getting away from "striving at literary effect," we are getting away from it.

[Kredov] Possibly, the question is not being asked of the right person (it would be more appropriate to ask I.S. Silayev), but, nonetheless: How do you assess the potential of the new Russian Government? Are you satisfied with the pace of its formation? Only half of the vacancies are filled yet.

[Khasbulatov] It would be improper to rush the chairman of the Council of Ministers. This is a case where he has to give some thought to this. Discussion of the candidacies in committees and commissions proceeded very seriously and, as a rule, several alternatives were looked into. I think the composition of the government promises that it will be strong. But the parliament should "push" the ministries and keep them in shape. At the same time, it is necessary to steadily broaden the range of their activity. Imagine, today Russian authorities do not have the right to register even a joint enterprise! Only with the interaction and mutual control of the Supreme Soviet and the cabinet of ministers will one or the other be able to work effectively.

[Kredov] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet was not conferred the "honor" immediately after being elected of being called Stalinist-Brezhnevist. However, charges of "rightist leanings" were made against it. How did the last session answer the skeptics (not about the labels but the facts)?

[Khasbulatov] I was not a skeptic even for a day. And I can say that firmly now that my expectations of fruitful work have been justified. People were assembled who for the most part were interesting and qualified, even though they had different levels of preparation. The slogan style of speeches is gradually disappearing, in my opinion, and this is apparent from television as well.

[Kredov] Your immediate supervisor, B.N. Yeltsin, left the CPSU; you remain a member of the Communist Party, but I.S. Silayev was put on the Central Committee (and in the words of the president of the USSR, "considered this an honor"). Will not this situation lead to discord between you and among parliamentarians? Are you not afraid of becoming a "second class" deputy?

[Khasbulatov] Boris Nikolayevich's position is consistent. He has said repeatedly that the head of state must be outside the party, especially under conditions of a multiparty system. For me also, the will of the voters is above everything else. If I feel the pressure, for example, of the Russian Central Committee, I will resolve a question. But in the meantime I remember that I myself can "bring pressure." Let Silayev in the Central Committee of the CPSU learn the opinions of communists and inform the government of them. This is beneficial. No, no battles on this question are envisioned in the Russian parliament.

[Kredov]... At the beginning of the interview I saw a portrait of V.I. Lenin on the wall of Khasbulatov's office, a detail which I would pay no attention to in bygone years in an interview with an official. Now the time came to inquire:

Ruslan Imranovich, did you bring this portrait with you? Or did you "inherit" it?

[Khasbulatov] "I inherited it." And I do not think it is necessary to take it down. I knew earlier than others of the shortcomings in the activity of Vladimir Ilyich. In the book "Socialism and Bureaucracy" published at the beginning of this year, I tried to present a political portrait of our country's bureaucracy, which, unfortunately, was born during Lenin's time. However, Lenin was an extremely brilliant personality, and not to consider his ideas would be methodologically incorrect.

[Kredov] While saying goodbye—it was getting close to 1900 hours and Khasbulatov had some kind of important meeting—I asked Ruslan Imranovich what, in my opinion, is a pressing question for today:

What do you think of the fact that a considerable part of the Russian deputies, it seems, is plunging into unparliamentary activity? I am making this judgment at least by a recent rally on Manezhnaya Square. The people obviously did not realize that they are the authority. They would rework the laws and translate into legal and economic languages the nice, but for the time being still empty "literary works"...

[Khasbulatov] Earnestly working deputies do not have time for rallies. Through your newspaper, I appeal to my colleagues: Become involved in work because there is no end to it. The people believe in the Russian parliament and in B.N. Yeltsin. All of the words have already been said, let us work on laws. There is a very critical shortage of them.

Russian Democratic Party Head on Reform

AU2607175390 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 24 Jul 90 p 5

[Interview with Nikolay Travkin, chairman of the Russian Democratic Party, by Henryk Chadzynski; place and date not given: "Consolidation Around the Reforms"]

[Text] [Chadzynski] What are the aims of the Russian Democratic Party and is it part of the social democratic movement?

[Travkin] We are not social democrats. The social democrats seek to create a society that is based on social justice and in order to accomplish this they are in favor of a total redistribution of material wealth. We also have the goal of social justice, but we want to do it differently, not through redistribution, but by creating equal opportunities for all.

[Chadzynski] You have often said that your party is a parliamentary-type party. With whom and on what terms would you like to unite?

[Travkin] We want to become a nucleus around which all other democratic forces can consolidate. The necessity for such crystallization is obvious if we look at the failed attempts made in the last two years to arrive at a "roundtable," and create something like a citizens' forum. Why have we failed to date? Because the whole democratic movement and all the parties that have sprung up are still weak and without structures and all

attempts to create a citizens' forum on such flimsy foundations have not proved successful. We have stated publicly that we are appealing to all democratic movements and forces in order to secure changes in society in a civilized way. We are against cooperating with organizations such as "Pamyat" or the right wing of the Democratic Union. It is very tempting to attract under one's banner all unofficial movements and groups, but for us it is not the numbers, but the ideological background that is all-important.

[Chadzynski] Which sector in the political arena is most important to you?

[Travkin] We see ourselves as a party of soviets, or rather a party for soviets. A party of soviet authority. The total number of people's deputies in Russia—from the township level right up to parliament—is some 800,000 people. This is the fundamental parameter of the political battle for influence. If the people's deputies are really supported in their efforts to implement effective democratic reforms, these reforms will stand a chance of being successful. It is not simply a matter of adopting a new law or decree, but of gaining public support for the reforms that are being introduced in Russia by the parliament.

[Chadzynski] Do you envisage any cooperation with the CPSU?

[Travkin] I believe that the CPSU is beginning to fade from the political arena, and its last two congresses, namely, the Congress of Russian Communists, and the 28th CPSU Congress, seem to confirm this. Of course, when one talks of the CPSU one has to distinguish between the party apparatus that was so abundantly represented at the 28th congress and the millions of rank and file members. I think that many of them will join us or the social democrats, or even some other new party.

[Chadzynski] What is your opinion of Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Travkin] I have great respect for him as he is a man of true moral principle and a person who possesses many qualities of a great politician. In one lifetime he has achieved a great deal and regardless of what he may do subsequently, he has earned his monument. For example, there is the fact that he allowed people to say what they think, and has supervised the introduction of glasnost. As a politician, he enjoys great international prestige. Thanks to him the world no longer sees us as the enemy. But as a result of our own inertia we are still waiting for Gorbachev to show us how to attain an auspicious future and how we are to transform the Russian economy. It is my opinion that Gorbachev has exhausted his possibilities concerning the internal matters of the country. He still maintains that we can achieve all our goals within the socialist framework and socialist values, because our society is incapable of understanding anything else. Such a view is the result of a social life within the limits of a particular ideological framework, and after reaching a certain age it becomes very difficult to refute it. However, we will not succeed in building a new economy on the basis of socialist ideology, because we are unable to motivate people to work. Today we cannot wait for Gorbachev to set the lead, and each republic must switch on its own engine of reforms.

[Chadzynski] Given the changed structure of forces in Soviet society, how necessary is it to have fresh elections in order to assure support for the democratic reforms?

[Travkin] The Russian parliament has also looked at this problem. At present, there are various meetings of the chairmen of national and regional Soviets, as well as chairmen of city soviets and the whole of the Russian federation. This exchange of views will show whether we need to turn to the electorate for an endorsement by way of a referendum. Do we need to change the structures of power? Above all, we must institute the office of the presidency in Russia through universal elections. New elections of new people's deputies to all levels of Soviets in more strictly limited numbers will spotlight new and capable politicians who will be answerable to the electorate. There are also arguments against bringing the elections forward, because political parties are still very weak and before any elections take place these parties ought to be given the opportunity to consolidate. Perhaps it would be better to wait two or three years and during this period we must work to change the situation. Hitherto, 74 percent of all the chairmen of various Soviets have held their chairmanship concurrently with other functions, for example, they might also be the head of a local kolkhoz, or the secretary of some party committee. The important thing is that our society come to believe that the elected people are really fighting for reforms and not merely playing political games in order to keep their posts.

[Chadzynski] Are you not afraid that this period of two or three years could be interrupted by conservative forces by way of a coup?

[Travkin] Such a coup would have happened a long time ago if there was a real possibility that such a coup could succeed. It is true that General Nenashev, as well as other supporters of the old method of leadership, are not alone in their thinking. Today, what the Army or KGB leadership thinks does not automatically mean that the whole Army or KGB organization thinks the same. Today, the process of social radicalization is so far advanced that reactionary forces can at best only obstruct this process, they are no longer in a position to stop it completely. That is why the role of such a nucleus could be crucial. It would provide a center around which democratic forces could begin to consolidate. This is precisely the goal of the Russian Democratic Party.

[Chadzynski] Thank you for the interview.

Polozkov Views on Congress, Conference

90UN2456A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jul 90 p 3

[Comments by I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, at a meeting in the Leninskiy Rayon CPSU Committee on 9 July reported by "Moscow Microphone": "What They Are Talking About in the Primary Organizations"]

[Text] The "Moscow Microphone" was switched on yesterday in the Leninskiy Rayon CPSU Committee where a meeting was being held with I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party.

It is fortunate that it was yesterday that PRAVDA published his speech at the 28th CPSU Congress. He said from the congress rostrum: "The main thing for the fate of Russia will be unity—the unity of the people, the unity of the country, and the unity of the party." And when he was asked here, in the raykom [rayon party committee], what he sees as the main slogan of the party at this very moment, Ivan Kuzmich said: "On party comradeship." And he noted that the predictions of those who foresaw a split in the party in the first hours of the congress did not come true. In his opinion, the program documents embody the beginning of consolidation, especially the rules.

Many questions were associated with the results of the forum of the communists of Russia.

[Question] Why in the end was it specifically this name and not the Russian Organization of the CPSU?

[Polozkov] There were such proposals, but the congress decided in favor of the current name. Although I am not convinced that it is the most correct.

[Question] Lenin was the theoretician of the revolution. Who is the country's theoretician now?

[Polozkov] We have fallen behind here, and we are in a blind alley, but we have to explain what we intend to build.

[Question] It is said that you are against cooperatives?

[Polozkov] I am against cheaters in the cooperative system.

[Question] Is it true that vineyards are being cut down in the Kuban?

[Polozkov] Like everywhere, old plants are being cut out. Plantations have not been reduced by even one hectare; to the contrary, they have been increased by thousands of hectares, and the deliveries of products from them have increased by several times in Leningrad alone.

[Question] Your attitude toward conservatives?

[Polozkov] Let us not be quick with labels.

[Question] How do you feel about the veterans and the past?

[Polozkov] I think we have begun to paint over the blank spots of history too quickly. Everyone is engaged in this who will take the trouble, while not understanding the paint at hand. I fear that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren might have to restore the canvases.

[Question] Do you have a large staff?

[Polozkov] I am alone in the Central Committee.

[Question] Your relations with G.Kh. Popov; where do you live?

[Polozkov] I am personally not acquainted. I live in a hotel. (Laughter in the hall.)

[Question] How are your relations with B.N. Yeltsin getting on?

[Polozkov] We are acquainted, we worked as first secretaries. He won in the elections to chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and I congratulated him. He has character and will. And I have character also. These two characters can work together for the renewal of Russia, and for its well-being. (Applause.)

The meeting was still going on when we submitted this material to the printer.

Ulyanovsk Raykom Urges Dismissal of Militia Head

PM2507132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Correspondent Valentin Razboynikov report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Raykom Against Militia"]

[Text] Ulyanovsk—At a plenum of Starokulatkinskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] R. Bekerov, chairman of the rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee], proposed dismissing M. Sharipov, chief of the rayon militia department.

The chairman declared that the militia cannot be trusted: It has weapons and, if something were to happen, its staffers might fire on people. It ended with the chief of the ROVD [rayon internal affairs department] being removed from the raykom. And the communist deputies who had only recently approved M. Sharipov in the post of ROVD chief now adopted the opposite decision: They debarred him from work for waging a poor struggle against crime and violations of law and order.

But the reasons evidently go far deeper here—the militia had simply ceased to fulfill the raykom's instructions.

At the raykom plenum the first secretary of the CPSU raykom declared literally the following: "Choose—either me or the militia chief." And the rayispolkom chairman chose.

As a mark of protest against M. Sharipov's dismissal militia workers appealed to the rayon's population to support their chief.

A commission arrived from Ulyanovsk and found that the ROVD chief was dismissed without grounds. But the raykom is standing by its decision. Maybe people really are waging a poor struggle against crime in the rayon. But, to be fair, let us point out that this rayon department was awarded the challenge red banner of the oblast soviet executive committee internal affairs administration.

Vladimir Party Leader Reassigned; Deputy Acting

PM2607142990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Vladimir, 24 Jul—A Vladimir Obkom [oblast party committee] plenum was held today to examine an organizational question. The plenum released G.F. Kondryukov from his duties as first secretary and bureau member of the CPSU obkom in connection with his reassignment.

Obkom Second Secretary N.V. Vinogradov was made acting first secretary of the CPSU obkom.

Rostov Nuclear Power Station To Be 'Mothballed'

LD2607222590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2101 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] [Announcer] At last, to judge by all appearances, the question of the Rostov nuclear station has been settled. It has been decided at a session of the oblast soviet to mothball the station.

[Correspondent A. Abramenko] Let us recall this was preceded by repeated and insistent demands by residents of the oblast that the construction of the station be suspended. Alas, the belated explanations from specialists that, in spite of the sad precedent of Chernobyl, nuclear power still does not present any danger turned out to be unconvincing.

[N.A. Plygunov, oblast soviet deputy] For three years the town of Volgodonsk has been waiting for and expecting the experts' report, which today the people do not accept, the experts' report on the Rostov nuclear power station.

[Abramenko] Taking account of this and the fact that an ecological report by experts, the only one capable of confirming whether or not the construction of the station is justified at all, has not yet been produced, the deputies adopted a decision to suspend it. At long last the 'i's have been dotted. Measures for the stage-by-stage mothballing of the station are to be elaborated in the immediate future. [video shows demonstrators outside building; soviet in session; interview with Deputy Plygunov]

Murmansk Food Supply Problems Discussed

PM2607115790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report by V. Anuchin, A. Uchinin from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Here's an alarming report from Murmansk. Our correspondent reports on disruption to supplies of meat products in that city.

[Reporter] [video shows interiors of supermarkets] Together with the film crew, we visited almost a dozen stores in Murmansk. We saw that the shelves marked "Meat and Poultry" were empty. There were long lines at stores that were still selling meat. And that meat was mainly pork. [video shows unidentified saleswoman]

[Saleswoman] In June we did business very rarely—maybe just three times over the month. Deliveries of chicken have been very few and far between. In the first 20 days of this month we've sold just one tonne of chicken and we've had just one delivery.

[Reporter] We then went to a refrigerated warehouse combine. [video shows empty cold store] This is where all the foodstuffs are sent. Its cold stores are currently 30 percent full. Dozens of storage areas are completely empty. [video shows unidentified official]

[Unidentified official] This situation has mainly been caused by the failure of our suppliers to come up with deliveries. Suppliers in Krasnodar Kray, Volgograd Oblast, Kalinin, Smolensk, Saratov, and a number of other oblasts are systematically disrupting meat deliveries.

[Reporter] Repeated appeals to the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Councils of Ministers and dozens of telegrams to the leaders of the suppliers' oblasts have produced nothing but promises. [video shows interviewee holding telegram addressed to Semenkov, Refrigerated Warehouse Combine, Murmansk, and reading: We repeat that there will be no meat deliveries to you in July. Our meat combines are under repair. There is no meat for the refrigerated warehouse combine. Your order has not been carried out. Rosmyasomoltorg has been informed. (Signed) Doronin, director of the refrigerated warehouse combine] Or answers along the following lines—supply us with timber, cement, and metal and then we'll carry out your orders, even though the Kola Peninsula does not produce these things. But since the oblast produces 20 percent of its own meat, the northerners themselves should think about further increasing subsidiary farming, expanding the capacity of the existing poultry factory, and, of course, building a new poultry factory. In order to do this, new capital investment will have to be found and the feed question

settled. Here in the polar region, with its severe conditions, it is almost impossible to produce this feed.

Stavropol Grain Harvest Going Well

PM2607150790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[Report over video on harvesting progress in Stavropol Kray from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The harvest in Stavropol Kray is drawing to a close. Local agricultural workers, having harvested 5.5 million tonnes of grain, are hoping to reach the 6 million-tonne mark within the next few days. To date 1.9 million tonnes of grain have been delivered to state granaries, in the main strong and valuable wheats. This means that the state order has been fulfilled.

A new method of agricultural work management—the cooperative method—has demonstrated its tremendous potential during this year's harvest. It has been applied most successfully on the state farm named for Sverdlov, Privolnoye Association, Krasnodar Kray [as heard], Stavropol region [Stavropolye], where these pictures have been taken.

Against the backdrop of our difficulties and problems the news from the Stavropol region is a cause for joy.

Perm Agro-Industry Blockade Threat Discussed

PM2607154090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jul 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Yu. Shatalov: "Hasty Ultimatum: Why the Perm Agro-Industry Formed a Strike Committee Before the Harvest"]

[Text] Perm Oblast—The other day the oblast kolkhoz [collective farm] council presidium and the agro-industrial committee board, at the request of a number of farm leaders, set up a temporary strike committee headed by M. Putilov, chairman of the oblast kolkhoz council and chairman of the "Rossiya" Kolkhoz. On behalf of all rural workers he issued an ultimatum: Unless the industrial enterprises of Perm and the other cities give the countryside effective assistance in feed procurement and harvesting in the near future, the agro-industrial complex will stop deliveries of milk, meat, and vegetables to the inhabitants of the said cities.

What is the reason for the conflict? It is well known, and did not spring up overnight. There is not enough manpower in the countryside, and in past years the city has been its support at harvest time. Many thousands of workers brought in from industrial enterprises used to work in the fields. This year the harvest in the Kama region is particularly abundant, but there is no one to gather it in. This year the city dwellers are in no hurry to help the peasants—it is not advantageous to them, and nowadays you cannot order anyone into the fields.

The mood of the farmers, who have worked conscientiously, is further blackened by the acute shortage of motor transport, feed and grain harvesting equipment, and spare parts for machines and equipment, and by poor trade and medical services to the country dwellers.

In early July, the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] adopted an additional decision on diverting 1,200 motor vehicles and more than 5,000 workers, engineers, technicians, and employees to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The leadership at a number of enterprises was instructed to increase the production of spare parts for agricultural equipment and ferroconcrete products for silage trenches, but alas, not many plants fulfilled irreproachably the oblispolkom decisions. As a result not many more than 700 of the 5,000 people had arrived on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes by 15 July, and about 400 of the 1,200 motor vehicles. As for the promised spare parts, ferroconcrete products, equipment, and implements, many of the oblast's farms are still waiting for them.

In this situation the presidium of the oblast kolkhoz council and the board of the agro-industrial committee adopted their ultimatum decision. The next day there was an emergency session of the oblispolkom, to which leaders from all rayons of Perm and the directors of the plants that did not hurry to help the rural dwellers were invited. The discussion was brief and tough: The chairmen of rayon soviets and rayispolkoms [rayon soviet executive committees] and the leaders of major enterprises were given to understand that all the responsibility for the possible consequences of a food blockade rests with them, since the oblispolkom had adopted decisions in good time on helping the countryside.

The very next day convoys of trucks were making their way from Perm to the periphery, enterprises began urgently to form teams for sending to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and some plants embarked on the production of spare parts. The conflict looked as if it was over, but passions again flared up at the strike committee session:

"We should demonstrate the strength of the Kama peasantry," the first deputy oblispolkom chiarman, who is also chairman of the oblast agro-industrial committee, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy A. Belorusov, observed menacingly. His own proposal was unanimously adopted—to convene in the near future a conference of workers in the agro-industrial complex to legitimize the strike committee, endow it with appropriate powers, and give its blessing to resolute actions.

The committee members talked calmly about the time lost beyond recall, the grain reception centers that were not prepared for work, the poor roads, and the contracts that had not been concluded, and heatedly discussed the problems of setting up a strike fund and the mechanism of the food blockade. Proposals were put forward with unusual facility on how to bring to their knees, in a

matter of days, first of all the inhabitants of Bereznyakov, Krasnokamsk, and Solikamsk, and then Perm itself.

As I listened to the quick-tempered speeches, this is what I thought. Why do these people actually want to "teach the worker a lesson"? How have the teachers and artists, writers and physicians, engineers and employees offended them? Or has the strike committee decided, perhaps, to punish the despondent old men and women who wander with their ever-hopeful string bags past the empty counters of the city's food stores?

However, many members of the strike committee are well aware that it is senseless to punish all the city dwellers in succession, but since there is no other way to bring the leaders of the enterprises, the cities, and the oblast to their senses, extreme measures will, in their opinion, have to be taken.

It cannot be denied that the present relationship between the city and the countryside is very far from ideal, agriculture is drained of its life blood, while many industrial enterprises continue to put their own financial affairs in order at its expense. To put it more simply, they have inflated the prices for their products which the country dwellers need, and now they have also stopped helping them. The government is in effect ignoring the distortion that has arisen and is basically not intervening at all in the situation. What can the peasants do? How can they attract attention to their problems?

But all the same, a strike is perhaps not the best way to resolve the accumulated problems. By disregarding the interests of the working people of a dozen cities in the western Urals and humiliating them by putting them on starvation rations, the strike committee will exacerbate the already difficult relationship between the city and the countryside and drive a wedge between them that will last a long time. Not for nothing have some places already started talking about countermeasures against the rural dwellers.

Attention must also be drawn to the following very important fact. The strike committee includes deputy chairmen of the oblast agro-industrial committee, leaders of its main services, chairmen of rayon agro-industrial associations and kolkhozes, sovkhoz [state farm] directors, leaders of processing enterprises, and even the chairman of the oblast committee of the agro-industrial complex workers' trade union. In short, the entire agro-industrial apparatus.

Did any labor collective delegate even one of these officials? No. N. Shatrov, director of the "Sepychevskiy" sovkhoz in Vereshchaginskiy Rayon, for isntance, said frankly that there is much talk of a strike among the workers, but no one has held a meeting to determine the labor collective's position. However, by all appearances neither he nor the other members of the self-styled strike committee is worried by this fact. They do not even entertain the idea that you can only speak on behalf of all the rural workers if they give you a mandate to do so.

It is therefore not surprising that A. Belorusov, chairman of the oblast agro-industrial committee, who is not formally a member of the strike committee, has in effect assumed the role of coordinator. He was the author of a highly significant phrase uttered at the strike committee session: "We cannot resolve things with the industrialists peacefully." But A. Belorusov and his supporters were wrong to see the bosses' reluctance to help only as a manifestation of the devil-may-care attitude of the working class and labor intelligentsia toward the countryside's needs. Many examples could be cited of cooperation between the labor collectives of industrial enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes, cooperation based not on directives and ultimatums, but on a mutually beneficial economic foundation. It is hard to imagine that Aleksandr Yefimovich does not know this.

So what stopped the agro-industrial committee from studying this practice beforehand and setting about making it widespread? Why was it absolutely necessary to enter into confrontation with the city on the very eve of the harvest and inflame passions in both city and countryside just before this very crucial period of work? Evidently the desire to shift the burden of their own sins onto others' shoulders was of some importance. And if that is so, there is an element of feigning and deliberate crowd manipulation in the strike committee's pose. "We cannt resolve matters peacefully..." But it must be clear to everyone that the way out of an acute situation can be found peacefully, and only peacefully.

Vegetable Supplies Improve in Perm Oblast

PM2607142190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Report by Mikhail Klepov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Economists are predicting that in the initial stage of the move toward the market relations between consumers and suppliers will deteriorate. But at the same time there are already examples of the two sides finding common ground. This is the subject of a report from our Perm correspondent Mikhail Klepov.

[Klepov] What's the current situation with fruit and vegetables? Are things better or worse than last year?

[B.A. Borchenko, deputy chairman of Perm City Soviet Executive Committee] This year we've brought 1,000 tonnes more fruit and vegetables into the city than we did last year. This year we've received tomatoes considerably earlier. We've been bringing in more cucurbits and fleshy fruits. For instance, last July we weren't trading melons and watermelons, whereas now we've obtained and are selling almost 70 tonnes. We've obtained grapes earlier this year. Products from the Central Asian republics have been arriving considerably earlier this year.

[Klepov] [video shows supermarket shelves full of produce] The leaders of the Perm city fruit and vegetables

trading system have become more active in their commercial activities. More direct contracts have been concluded with suppliers, and various options are being discussed, including barter trade in certain goods produced in the Western Urals. The sole aim is to buy in foodstuffs more cheaply and sell as much of them as possible to the populace. And, quite frankly, this aim is being achieved. Prices for vegetables in Perm are, as they say, reasonable and the selection is quite good—there are plenty of things to choose. What is convenient for customers is that in the most populous areas vegetable markets have been organized. There are currently 15 of them—mainly in the center. The oblast executive committee has accommodated the residents of Perm by raising potato prices by a minimal amount. At the same time, purchase prices of potatoes have been doubled. The difference is covered out of the local budget. Currently vegetable deliveries from the oblast's collective and state farms are being expanded. Direct contracts have been concluded with them too.

Western Republics

Belorussia Adopts Sovereignty Declaration 27 Jul

LD2707105690

[Editorial Report] Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian at 0700 GMT on 27 July begins to carry a live relay of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session in Minsk. The session is devoted to a debate on the Belorussian state sovereignty declaration.

At 1027 GMT, the sovereignty declaration is unanimously approved with 229 votes for, none against, and no abstentions.

Belorussian 27 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Aired

LD2707122490

[Editorial Report] Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian and Russian at 0700 GMT on 27 July begins to broadcast a live relay of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session in Minsk. The chairman states that debate will continue on the Belorussian sovereignty declaration.

At 0718 GMT, the vote on Article 11 is approved, providing for the republic to freely unite with other states and to freely secede from the state Union.

At 0719 GMT, deputies begin discussion on Article 10, which deals with troops in Belorussia.

At 0731 GMT, deputies vote for Belorussia to have its own troops under the control of the Belorussian soviet socialist republic.

At 0742 GMT, deputies vote for Belorussia to be a nuclear-free zone and a neutral state.

At 0750 GMT, deputies vote that military bases of other states cannot be located on Belorussian territory without the approval of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet.

At 0753 GMT, article 10 is read and voted on. Article 10 is adopted by 237 votes for, one vote against.

At 0757 GMT, deputies return to vote on amendments to the preamble.

At 0833 GMT, the text of preamble read out.

At 0838 GMT, the preamble is adopted by 235 votes for, one vote against.

At 0843 GMT, deputies proceed to debate Article 12 which states that only those articles in the Belorussian constitution which are not counter to the sovereignty declaration are valid. A lengthy and sometimes heated debate ensues.

At 0857 GMT, the chairman calls for a vote on Article 12 but many deputies are unhappy at being rushed.

At 0901 GMT, the chairman declares a 30-minute break, and the relay ends.

At 0933 GMT, the relay resumes. The chairman calls deputies to register and recalls that there had been 241 deputies present at the first session.

At 0935 GMT, it is announced that a quorum is present.

AT 0937 GMT, various amendments are proposed.

At 0942 GMT, the register of deputies is taken again. 235 are present.

At 0944 GMT, Article 12 is read again. The chairman calls for a vote.

At 0950 GMT, Article 12 is adopted.

At 0951 GMT, deputies resume debate on Article 12.

At 1007 GMT, the vote on a slight amendment to Article 11 is adopted.

At 1010 GMT, Article 11 with the new amendment is adopted by 222 votes to 1.

At 1011 GMT, debate resumes on Article 12.

At 1019 GMT, a slight amendment to Article 12 adopted.

At 1024 GMT, article 12 adopted as a whole by 229 votes to 0.

At 1025 GMT, clarification is provided on the definition of nationalities in Article 9.

At 1027 GMT, a vote is taken on the entire sovereignty declaration. It is adopted unanimously by 229 votes to 0.

At 1029 GMT, the chairman outlines tomorrow's program and proceeds to call for a vote on a Supreme Soviet resolution on Chernobyl.

Belorussian 26 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Aired

New Constitution Discussed

LD2607144690

[Editorial Report] Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian at 1300 GMT on 26 July resumes its broadcast of a live relay of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session in Minsk.

At this time, discussion continues on the need for a Belorussian currency. Some deputies refer to Ukraine's declaration which contains the point on the republic's fight to print its own currency, stating that Belorussia should follow Ukraine in this respect. Other deputies object. After further discussion, the article is adopted by a majority. It reads: The republic creates its own national bank, own system of taxes, customs service and can introduce a separate currency.

At 1330 GMT, the deputies discuss the article stating that the republic has the right to a just proportion of the country's gold and diamond reserves and hard currency fund. A vote is held and it is adopted by a majority.

At 1345 GMT, the deputies discuss the article stating that the republic is one, an integral and indivisible republic. No territorial matters within its borders can be meddled with by external forces. The article is adopted.

At 1355 GMT, deputies discuss the article on the new constitution. The article states that until the new constitution of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is worked out, the existing one remains in operation, provided its provisions do not run counter the declaration. If they do, the declaration overrules. The article is adopted.

At 1410 GMT, deputies discuss the article on citizenship matters and rights of citizens. Deputy Poznyak says sovereignty means that no citizen of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic should carry out instructions or orders from external centers, from Berlin, Washington, Moscow and others. The article is voted down.

At 1415 GMT, secondary amendments are proposed to various paragraphs. With regard to the rights of the republican procurator's office, it is decided that it is to oversee that all laws of the Belorussian SSR are carried out within the republic by one and all.

At 1425 GMT, the opposition attempts once again to introduce a point on external political centers, but fails.

At 1430 GMT, a 15-minute break is announced.

Culture, Security Issues Viewed

LD2607161790

[Editorial Report] Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian at 1445 GMT on 26 July resumes its live relay of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session in Minsk.

Deputies register. There are 285 deputies present.

Amendments to the paragraph on ecology include a claim for compensations from all-Union bodies for disasters such as Chernobyl. The republic's sovereignty must be directed at protecting all inhabitants of Belorussia. This amendment is passed.

At 1510 GMT, cultural developments are discussed. Additions and corrections to the draft are presented by Deputy Gilevich, a Belorussian writer. Some terms and notions substituted by firmer expressions. This chapter should ban monopolization of the mass information media and authorize national-historic, rather than state symbols, such as the anthem, coat of arms, and flag. The state must ensure favorable conditions for the development and functioning of the Belorussian language. National, cultural, and historical values on the territory of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] are exclusively the property of the people of Belorussia. This amendment is passed, except for the point on the monopolization of the mass media.

At 1530 GMT, external and domestic security are discussed. Amendments are voiced on the subordination of internal organs and troops and army detachments. They must be controlled by the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet. Some deputies observe that since Belorussia has no intention of withdrawing from the Union, all additions of this nature are superfluous. A prolonged discussion ensues on the national army. A vote is held on the rendering: "Belorussia has the right to national armed forces" or "Belorussia has national armed forces". The former version is approved.

At 1550 GMT, the right to secession is discussed. It is proposed that Belorussia adopt decisions independently on joining or withdrawing from federations.

At 1600 GMT, the live relay ends.

IAEA Offers Belorussia Chernobyl Cleanup Help

90UN2329C Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

["Abbreviated version" of speech by IAEA General Director H. Blix to Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet; place and date not given: "IAEA Offers Assistance"]

[Text] **H. Blix, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) general director, spoke at a session of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet and proposed a specific program of assistance in eliminating the aftereffects of the Chernobyl disaster. Here we publish an abbreviated version of his speech.**

Following the accident at Chernobyl, the IAEA offered the Soviet Union its services in identifying the technical reasons for what took place. These will be analyzed by Soviet experts along with scientists and engineers from all over the world. The tragedy which took place must be explained. Appropriate lessons must be learned from it.

The analysis which followed the accident at Chernobyl was the starting point for the adoption of a whole series of measures, on the national as well as international level, to reinforce safety in the atomic energy field, and also to reduce the potential consequences of any other similar accident, should one occur.

Still another set of decisions is under discussion today, concerning civic responsibility for losses and damage which can result from nuclear accidents. A multilateral international assessment of the radiological environment resulting from the Chernobyl disaster is being developed.

The studies conducted by our specialists concerned levels of radiation, maps of which were drawn up by your specialists, and checking the data and figures which were obtained here.

This effort will yield an evaluation of present and future radiation doses people receive. International experts are working jointly with Soviet experts. I have given the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences a very sophisticated instrument—a gamma spectrometer. It can be used in field experiments as well as in the laboratory to establish the radiation level in any object, as well as its source.

The IAEA has also distributed thousands of dosimeters, chiefly among children of the three republics, in order to determine and be fully aware of what amount of radiation they are receiving from the outside world. We will also soon be sending a truck outfitted with special devices of a subsonic-frequency spectrometer system, which can be used to determine what contamination dose one person or another is receiving from foods. Of course, these measures can in no way substitute for the tremendous systematic effort you are presently undertaking. But they will be able to verify and render more precise, which will also prove valuable.

Over the course of half a year more than a hundred prominent international experts in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and radiation protection will arrive here as part of various programs, with various tasks, so as to bring together into a unified whole all the diverse aspects of today's situation and provide their conclusions. A report will be prepared by the end of autumn and the results of this group's efforts presented. The report will treat a whole series of questions of interest to the people as well as to the organs of power. Specifically, it will touch on safety measures which have already been or are being taken. These are based on scientific data. The extensive international program I am referring to now is not provided for in the budgets of international organizations. It has become possible because we found our own financial resources. International experts agreed to extend voluntary, free assistance. This program is not being undertaken with the aim of satisfying world curiosity. It has the goal of providing assistance to you and your fraternal republics in the fight against the aftereffects of the Chernobyl accident.

I have been asked many times—can an organization whose charter demands the development of nuclear energy be reliably expected to render an unbiased, objective report? My response is in the affirmative. Yes, IAEA is proud of the fact that it is a scientific organization—and its adherence and faithfulness to scientific standards and the scientific search for truth come before any ambitions whatsoever.

Participating in the program are scientists from all over the world with no relationship whatsoever to the propaganda of nuclear power engineering. The group of scientists is headed by the director of the Hiroshima Nuclear Research Institute and will also include members of the Academies of Science of Belorussia and the Ukraine.

Finally—I understand that, following the Chernobyl accident, most people relate skeptically to the opinions of any experts. We must be prepared to accept critical doubt. Our scientific research is conducted with complete openness. And the report will be presented for broad discussion in your country, in the Ukraine, and in Vienna. I am convinced that it will stand up to any criticism.

I hope people will accept our scientific quest with gratitude and respect—only if this is the case will the social measures deemed both humane and prudent be undertaken.

Ukrainian Deputies on Resignation From CPSU

LD2607220290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2101 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Report by correspondent L. Ilchenko at the 26 July session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet in Kiev, including remarks by V.B. Grinev, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The formation of the government continued today at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine.

[Ilchenko] Weighing the words and deeds of the candidates, the majority of whom had occupied their posts previously, the members of parliament are approaching the selection of each candidacy strictly, and it was no surprise when the finance minister's place in the government remained vacant.

Besides these concerns determined by their standing orders, the deputies are also agitated by the republic's acute political issues, which are continually arising and demanding the parliamentarians' attention. For example, a group of people's deputies numbering 26 CPSU members delivered a statement on their resignation from the CPSU:

[Grinev] A group of people who think as I do, not only in the Ukraine but in Russia, too, based on the idea of the Democratic Platform, have come up with the idea of

organizing a new-style party, and we are orienting our activity not only toward establishing a party, but also toward creating a number of democratic forces which will take the ideas of perestroyka to their logical conclusion. That logical conclusion, in my view, is the establishment of a multiparty, civil society in our country, the economic basis of which will be a civilized market economy.

'Democratic Platform' To Establish Ukraine Party

PM2607151790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Correspondent Sergey Tsikora report under the rubric "Direct Link": "Deputies Who Have Become Nonparty Deputies"]

[Text] Kiev—Events have occurred in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet which make you take seriously the recent statement by the Democratic Platform in the Ukrainian Communist Party of its intention to create a new political party in the republic.

I mean the statement which Ukrainian SSR People's Deputy V. Filenko read out from the session rostrum. Considering that all sessions of parliament are relayed in full over the radio and Ukrainian television, in terms of its political significance that address went far beyond ordinary information for members of parliament.

The statement reports the collective withdrawal from the CPSU of Ukrainian SSR people's deputies who share the theses of the Democratic Platform. The statement was signed by 28 parliamentarians from Kharkov, Donetsk, Dnepropetrovsk, Ternopol, Sumy, Ivano-Frankovsk, Kiev, Crimean, Zaporozhye, Volyn, and Vinnitsa Oblasts.

The statement says that, in their opinion, the five years of perestroyka and the results of the 28th party congress have failed to justify people's hopes. "The CPSU remains even ...ow not a party but a state-managerial structure. Party committees continue to place themselves above soviets of people's deputies." The document reports that it is planned to hold the constituent congress of the new party being created in the republic on the basis of the "Democratic Platform in the Ukrainian Communist Party" in November 1990.

Ukraine Government, Miners Strike Committee Meets

Miners Ask Gurenko To Leave

LD2707110490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 Jul 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] In Kiev, a delegation of miners asked Stanislav Gurenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, who had expressed the wish to be present at the talks between the Ukrainian government and representatives of the miners' strike committees, to leave the conference hall.

Stanislav Gurenko had to leave. The miners stated that they did not trust the Communist Party and the Union government and that they linked all their hopes with the newly elected leadership of the republic.

At the talks it was proposed to set up a State committee of the Coal Industry of the Ukraine and to give the sector fully over to Republican command.

Questions of the profitability of mines, the creation of zones of free enterprise, and the sale of coal abroad were discussed.

An INTEFAX correspondent reports that opposing points of view are being expressed at the talks and mutual accusations are being voiced.

'Modernization' Seen as Problem

LD2607175490 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 25 Jul 90

[Text] Today a group of representatives of Ukrainian miners met in Kiev with members of the republic's government. At the very beginning of the meeting the miners demanded that First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Stanislav Gurenko, should leave the hall where the meeting was held. Then the miners insisted that TV journalists also leave the hall, due to the fact that the meeting was to be held in a business- like manner.

As far as the main objective of the meeting is concerned, the miners said they don't trust any more in the USSR Government and placed their last hope in the government of the Ukraine. The main problem pointed to by the miners was poor modernization of the mines, 70 percent of wich had not been modernized for 20 years and even longer. The miners also pointed to low wages and inadequate social and living conditions.

To solve these problems, the chairman of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet [title as heard], Vitaliy Masol, proposed to set up a state committee of mining industry of the Ukraine under the Council of Ministers, which will deal with all the problems facing the mining industry. The proposal was accepted by the miners.

Discussed was also the question of the efficiency of the republic's mines, the setting up of the zone of free enterprise in Donetsk coal basin, the export of Ukrainian coal, and so on. Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers Vitol Fokin said on the completion of the meeting that it was fruitful.

New Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

PM2607114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Sergey Tsykora report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "New Leader and Old Problems"]

[Text] Kiev—Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk has been elected chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

His election by the republic parliament has ended the latest crisis, which was provoked on this occasion by the replacement of the head of the republic. After V. Ivashko's unexpected resignation, the Ukraine's top post was vacant for almost two weeks. The presidium registered 27 contenders when nominations opened.

The first round of the election did not, however, produce a clear victor, but merely allowed the two who won the largest number of votes to go forward. But just before actual voting began in the second round, one of the contenders—Academician I. Yukhovskiy, leader of the official opposition in the Ukrainian parliament—withdrew. The name of another candidate, who had received only 19 votes in the first round, had to be included on the secret ballot paper. The runoff brought an outright victory for L. Kravchuk. He received 239 of the votes cast by the 315 deputies taking part (I would remind people that the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] currently has 449 deputies).

Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk is 56 years old. He is a professional party worker. He began his career in this field in 1960 as a consultant and then as lecturer and department chief in the Chernovitsy Oblast party committee. In the course of 30 years he rose to the post of Ukrainian Communist Party second secretary.

His name became best known in the republic during the recent period of the birth of new sociopolitical organizations. Kravchuk was one of the few party workers who had the courage to engage in open and direct discussion—including rallies and television debates—with the leaders of Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka], Green Light, Memorial...

Thanking deputies for their expression of trust, L. Kravchuk, already as head of the Ukrainian republic, said:

"The time of confrontation is over, it is now time to engage in dialogue and make the decisions the people need."

As of now, however, it is difficult to say how this desire will be put into practice. L. Kravchuk's election victory in parliament was ensured by the group For a Soviet Sovereign Ukraine (in parliament it is still called the group of 239 deputies), which comrises party workers, economic managers, and some soviet workers. Speaking after the vote, the opposition stated that the members of the People's Rada [council] did not take part, as previously, in the election of the head of the republic, considering that "party interests prevailed over those of the people this time. Therefore the People's Rada will remain in opposition in parliament."

The new head of the republic's first day of work was difficult. As these lines are being sent, the squares outside the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet and the Kiev Soviet are thronged with people. The national blue and yellow flags are to be seen everywhere. Trolleybuses and streetcars are not running in the city. The drivers have declared a strike.

Girenko Visits Ukraine's Kherson Oblast

LD2607173690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Girenko, CPSU Central Committee secretary, was in Kherson Oblast 24 July. He met with the party aktiv of the oblast and the oblast center. There was a detailed conversation on the results of the 28th CPSU Congress. The Central Committee secretary toured Kherson Oblast.

Chernobyl Engineer Says No. 4 Block Still Threat

AU2607140090 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 26 Jul 90 p 9

[Report by Christoph Marschall: "Concrete Enclosure of Reactor Leaky"]

[Text] Munich, 25 July—Over four years after the reactor catastrophe of Chernobyl, the damaged fourth block of the power plant still poses a danger. A total of 100 square meters of the concrete enclosure of the damaged block, called "sarcophagus," are leaky, because the energy released inside the block destroys the construction material, Vladimir Shovkoshytnyy, a senior engineer at the nuclear power plant until 1987 and a convinced opponent of nuclear power plants today, has stated in Munich. There are plans to build a second sarcophagus, which, however, will probably have the same fate.

Foreign experts will be invited to visit the Ukrainian Republic to discuss alternatives to the "never ending construction of new sarcophaguses," Shovkoshytnyy stressed, who was elected to the Ukrainian parliament in March. He heads the subcommittee for problems within the 30-km zone surrounding Chernobyl.

Since the declaration of sovereignty by the Ukrainian Republic last week, the chances that at least part of the problems caused by the reactor accident can be solved have increased, Shovkoshytnyy stated. Moscow used to be responsible for questions concerning nuclear energy, and there was little interest in Moscow to reveal the real extent of the disaster. However, the declaration of independence by no means implies that the Ukrainian Republic will renounce the help of the Soviet Union in overcoming the consequences of the catastrophe. The amount of R16.5 billion, provided by Moscow, is not sufficient at all.

Five million hectares of the soil surrounding Chernobyl are so contaminated that its use has been banned. Over 200,000 people should be evacuated from areas where radiation exceeds the permitted value of five curie per square kilometer. Values reaching 30 times the allowed amount have been measured in individual cases. As a matter of fact, the new Ukrainian parliament has made available R1.6 billion, but the republic is not in a position to raise the actually required sum. Shovkoshytnyy asked foreign countries for help, "not only at the state level." He called for the establishment of Chernobyl associations.

Doguzhiyev on Resettlement of Crimean Tatars

PM2507142190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 22 Jul 90

[Report by V. Plotnikov, G. Bulanov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Newscaster] One of our difficult problems today is the fate of the Crimean Tatars, who want to return to the land of their forefathers. An extramural session of the State Commission for the Problems of the Crimean Tatar People has been held in Simferopol.

[Reporter] Tented cities of Crimean Tatar pickets have been visible in Simferopol, Alushta, and Yalta for several months. People are demanding that the conditions be created for them to return to their homeland as quickly as possible. To be fair, it should be said that the local authorities are doing all in their power and are allocating tracts of land to them. The first Crimean Tatar villages have already been readied for resettlement. But the oblast doesn't have enough resources to deal with all comers. The other day the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution which is the priority, urgent section of the program being elaborated by the government for the return of the Crimean Tatars. Just what is planned?

[V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Commission for the Problems of the Crimean Tatar People] The initial stage will cover 1990-1991. And it envisages the resolution of the main questions. What are they? To resettle those who had already arrived here as of 1 June. All these people need to be resettled. We need to allocate them plots of land and see how to create a social infrastructure for them, even if it's basic. That's the first task. The second task we have to resolve is to create the construction capacity to resolve the tasks defined by the program. And that will be a considerable increase. Construction workers will not be able to solve the problem using the construction capacity available in the Crimea. In this connection we are pinning great hopes on individual construction—particularly in the initial stages. But there is also the question of supplying construction materials to people who have decided to build their own housing themselves. We have agreed to announce a resettlement plan during July-August—that is, we'll say how many people certain areas can absorb this year and next year.

Lvov Obkom, Deputies Vie for Premises

90UN2329A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 90 p 1

[Article by Colonel V. Bogdanovskiy: "The Fuss About the Third Floor"]

[Text] In its 4 July issue, the newspaper ZA VILNU UKRAINU published the statement of arbiter O. Bobelyak of the Lvov Oblast State Board of Arbitration: "The Obkom [oblast committee] Must Make Room." The statement explains the essence of the matter. At its roots is a change in the terms of an agreement concluded between the ispolkom [executive committee] of the oblast soviet of people's deputies and the obkom of the Ukrainian Communist Party concerning the leasing of the nonresidential premises on 18 Sovetskaya Street, and the move of the party obkom apparatus out of the building's third floor within seven days. The reason: The oblispolkom [oblast executive committee] had to afford premises to deputies of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and USSR Supreme Soviet for them to execute their deputy responsibilities.

This is not a new issue, it was noted. And the party obkom was not posturing itself—it had studied the question carefully and was offering the oblast council various options, including a redistribution of premises and specifically turning over to the oblispolkom 18 individual offices on the fourth floor. But the oblispolkom people have rejected this offer and are insisting on transfer of the third, primarily because this is where the basic structural subdivisions, specially outfitted offices, and communications are located, i.e., the vitally important functional arteries of the oblast party committee.

To deny the party obkom these "arteries"—this, we feel, is the main purpose of the oblast soviet.

Army Brutality Rumor Fails in Lvov

PM2507140390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jul 90 First Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent V. Drozd report under the "Well I Never" rubric: "'Roast' on the Menu..."]

[Text] Lvov—Speaking at last week's session of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, Ukrainian People's Deputy L. Gorokhivskiy flabbergasted his colleagues, weary after a day's work, with a "sensation": For no apparent reason, 50 soldiers used entrenching tools to attack people who had gathered to celebrate John the Baptist Day in the village of Ulashkovtsa in the Ternopol region.

But the sensation, served in the form of roast canard Baron Muenchhausen style, did not work. The newly hatched chick produced a feeble cheep. ZA VILNU UKRAINU, a newspaper published by the Lvov Oblast Soviet, then took on the thankless task of somehow making a meal of this chick. A rebuttal published the previous day by the Carpathian Military District's SLAVA RODINY, and its appeal to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, did not stop it. The appeal had been signed by two of the victims, by deputies, and by "Rukh" [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] aktiv members. They considerably amended what Gorokhivskiy had said: There was common-or-garden hooliganism on both sides and "no one brought entrenching tools to bear."

What do you think ZA VILNU UKRAINU journalists should have done after this? Seeing that the day before readers were intrigued by allegations that something had happened in the countryside, they should have said: We will report the details, and should have simply reported that nothing sensational had occurred. But everything indicates that this turn of events had not figured in the editorial office's calculations, and was not to its liking.

So, almost one-third of a page of Sunday's edition was taken up with an article under the rubric: "The Army: Whom Does It Serve?" Then, without a second's hesitation, the newspaper reported that, had it not been for Gorokhivskiy's statements, no one would have been any the wiser as to what happened. So why not—let us add this for ourselves—sound the alarm every time there is an ordinary drunken brawl? Journalists were also forced to acknowledge this, in an admittedly somewhat skittish tone, in the "first few sentences": "There were no goons dressed up in paratroopers' uniform, entrenching tools were not brought to bear, there was no ethnic undercurrent, there was no pregnant woman here." What did happen? Leaving aside the details, here we have forced attempts by journalists to prove that a "supernational army cannot protect the Ukrainian people's national interests"...

Well then, the "independent" newspaper's journalists can be happy: They have once again fallen into step with people who describe the Army as an "occupying" army. One can only sympathize with the newspaper's readers: Instead of the promised fatted fowl, they have been treated to a weedy chick with a political tinge.

Kiev Streetcar, Trolleybus Drivers Strike

PM2607150790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Jul 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Male Newscaster] Hundreds of thousands of the Ukrainian capital's inhabitants were late for work today. Not a single streetcar or trolleybus was running today. [video shows idle vehicles, workers debating]

Transport workers submitted a number of demands to the city authorities, including higher wage rates for drivers; bonuses to be paid for vehicles running on time; compensation for work done during the Chernobyl accident and subsequently; raising the question of lowering drivers' pensionable age at the republic Supreme Soviet; allocating 100 apartments annually to the streetcar and trolleybus administration; and placing orders for spare parts and accessories for passenger vehicles with the city's enterprises without delay. A number of bus enterprises decided to join the strike.

[Female Newscaster] We have just received a report from our correspondents in Kiev: The City Soviet of People's Deputies has adopted a decision to largely satisfy the demands of the streetcar and trolleybus administration workers, to generalize their other demands, and to submit them for examination by the City Soviet Executive Committee by 15 August this year. By evening the city's electric transport was back in operation.

Ukrainian Decree on Time Zone Change

90UN2250A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 17 Jun 90 p 3

["Resolution of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet on a Change in the Procedures for Calculating the Time on the Territory of the Ukrainian SSR"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet resolves as follows:

1. That from 1 July 1990 the territory of the Ukrainian SSR will be considered to be within the second time zone, without the addition of the one hour (Moscow time minus one hour).

Movements of railroad, air, and maritime transport and interrepublic automobile transport in general use, and also the operation of the intercity telephone and telegraph communications, will operate on Moscow time.

2. To assign to Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers the task of ensuring the introduction of the new procedure for calculating the time on republic territory.

[Signed] V. Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.
[Dated] Kiev, 11 June 1990.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution

LD2607201290 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Takiy]

[Text] Kishinev July 26 TASS—The Moldavian parliament today adopted amendments to the republic's constitution.

One of the amendments says that the laws of the Soviet Union and other legal acts by bodies of state authority and administration and also decrees by the USSR president will be valid on the republic's territory only after they are ratified by its parliament.

Under the amendments, the republican parliament has the right to restrict or suspend at any time the laws of the Soviet Union, already ratified by it, on Moldavian territory.

Until today, the Moldavian Supreme Soviet had the right, under its fundamental law, to suspend on its territory only acts by the USSR Council of Ministers.

The Moldavian parliament's powers are extended in accordance with the declaration on the sovereignty of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldavia, which was adopted more than a month ago.

The standing commissions of the Moldavian parliament will begin to consider and prepare for ratification 32 major union laws shortly. Moldavian people's deputies today adopted a resolution to approach the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR with the legislative initiative for making amendments to the counytry's constitution.

Contrary to the USSR constitution, the Moldavian parliament adopted a law envisaging the transfer of all Moldavian public prosecutors' offices from under the authority of the USSR public prosecutor's office to that of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet.

Under the proposal of the parliament president, lawyer Dumitru Postovan, 42, was elected chief public prosecutor of Moldavia.

Moldovan Supreme Soviet Approves New Laws

LD2607183390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] The session of the Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] of Moldova Supreme Soviet has continued work in Kishinev. Yesterday, the deputies concluded debates and approve the republican government's concept of transition to a regulated market economy. Today they started examining a number of draft laws related to this. After discussion, a Moldova SSR law on regulating the export and import of goods was approved. Also, the deputies adopted amendments to the constitution which stipulate terminating the Moldova SSR Procuracy's subordination to the USSR Procuracy and subordinating it to the republican Supreme Soviet.

The session also adopted a decree on state power in the Moldova SSR. It says that absolute state power in the republic belongs to the Supreme Soviet. No political party or public movement can take upon itself any leadership functions or be financed from the state budget. Holding both party and state posts is forbidden.

Gagauz Representatives Hold Extraordinary Congress

PM2607113990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Eduard Kondratov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Gagauzes Demand Autonomy"]

[Text] Kishinev—An extraordinary congress of official representatives of the Gagauz people was held in the city of Komrat.

The bulk of Gagauzes live on the territory of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova. Throughout recent years the Gagauz public has persistently demanded the creation of an autonomous formation—namely, the Gagauz ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]—within this Union republic. Although the question of the exercise of the Gagauzes' right to self-determination will be examined at the next sessions of the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet, participants in the extraordinary congress decided to anticipate it by adopting an interim provision on elections to the Gagauz ASSR Supreme Soviet...

Caucasus

Soviet Kurds Demand Autonomous Region

AU2707093090 Paris AFP in English 0823 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 27 (AFP)—The first congress of Soviet Kurds ended Thursday in Moscow with the adoption of a resolution demanding that the Kremlin examine the possibility of the establishment of an autonomous region in Soviet Kurdistan.

Kurdish representatives from Iraq, Iran, Turkey and Syria attended the conference, which was held with the approval of Soviet authorities.

The president of the congress, Karim Nadirov, pointed out to reporters that an autonomous Kurdish region had existed between 1923 and 1929 in present-day Azerbaijan, before the Kurds were dispersed throughout Central Asia by Stalin in the 1930s and 1940s. Asked about Azerbaijani reactions to the Kurdish claim, Mr. Nadirov said that "for the moment, they have said nothing."

An official census in 1989 put the number of Kurds in the Soviet Union at some 153,000, but Mr. Nadirov estimated the figure to be over 500,000. He said that the Supreme Soviet would create a commission in September, composed of deputies and Kurdish representatives, to examine possibilities for improving conditions in the Turkish community such as the establishment of a radio station and a newspaper.

Kurdish Iraqi representative Mahmed Osman described the Soviet authorities' decision to allow the conference as "perhaps the first positive sign of a change" in policy towards the Kurds, but nonetheless denounced the

"silence" of the Soviet Union and the Soviet press regarding Iraq's use of poison gas against its Kurdish minority.

Azerbaijan Party Congress Resumes 27 Jul

LD2707082390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] After the break taken during the period of work of the 28th CPSU Congress, the Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress resumed today in Baku. On the agenda are discussion of the report on the results of the 28th CPSU Congress and the pressing tasks facing the republican party organization.

Popular Front Branch Activity in Sabirabad Halted

NC2707071090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 26 Jul 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers have published a statement by the procuracy of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In accordance with the decision adopted by the Sabirabad Rayon People's Deputies Soviet Executive Committee, the activities of the Sabirabad branch of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan were halted on 4 April 1990. All the materials [materialler] were handed over to the rayon's procuracy. A criminal case was opened on 26 July to investigate violations of law by the executive board of the Sabirabad branch of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan. Kurban Mamedov, head of the Sabirabad branch, was charged on the basis of the accumulated evidence, and remanded into custody. The matter is being investigated.

An AZERINFORM correspondent has asked K. Suleymanov, procurator of Sabirabad Rayon, to provide information on this, in addition to the disclosure made by the republic's procuracy. The newspapers have published the information provided by Suleymanov.

Militia Workers Dismissed From Posts in NKAO

NC2507105190 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 24 July 90

[Text] The leaders of Azerbaijan, are consistent in pursuing their anti-Armenian policies in Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO], but they alter the form and method of their actions according to the demands of the times. They are now exploiting the recent [11 July] incident which took place on the road from Mir-Bashir to Kelbadzhar to dismiss Armenian militia workers in the oblast. For example, Vladimir Danielyan, director of Mardakertskiy Rayon internal affairs department, was dismissed at the orders of the minister for having violated the border of Kelbadzarskiy Rayon and for firing four shots from his pistol. The militia officer had fired his pistol while pursuing persons who had stolen animals.

The fact is that the inhabitants of the Armenian villages are in despair not only because of the lack of security but also because of the lack of employment opportunities in the villages. There has been a great deal of talk about creating jobs in the villages but nothing has been achieved. The people are also uneasy over the way the Armenian Supreme Soviet sessions are progressing. Artsakh hopes the situation in Armenia will stabilize and the parliament will find time to tackle the problems of the NKAO.

Armenian Militants Refuse To Hand Over Arms

AU2707103890 Paris AFP in English 1035 GMT 27 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 27 (AFP)—Armenian nationalists are refusing to dissolve their militias and turn in their weapons as ordered in a decree by President Mikhail Gorbachev, nationalist sources told AFP. "No one will respect the decree and no one will turn in their weapons. We would rather die than give up our arms," said Razmik, the leader of the Armenian National Army, the principal militia, which claims more than 20,000 members.

Mr. Gorbachev issued a decree Wednesday declaring the militias which have sprung up around the Soviet Union over the past several years to be illegal, and giving them two weeks to turn their weapons over to the authorities.

"For the moment, the situation is normal in Yerevan and the army is not taking any action. If they don't try anything, everything will be all right," added Razmik, who is known only by his nom de guerre. He said that it would be necessary to wait for the 15-day period to expire before judging the attitude of the Army.

A spokesman for the Armenian National Movement, the leading nationalist organization which also has its own militia, told AFP that his movement viewed the decree "negatively" and did not intend to take any initiatives. "The Supreme Soviet should meet to discuss the question and take the appropriate decision," he said.

He implied that the Armenian parliament should overturn the presidential decree using the same strategy as the republic of Moldavia, which modified its constitution to affirm that all Soviet laws and presidential decrees should be ratified by parliament.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Commission on Decree

LD2607135790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Yerevan—At the session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet today a special commission was set up in connection with the presidential decree on banning the creation of armed formations not provided for by the legislation of the USSR and on the confiscation of weapons possessed illegally.

Armenia Restores Ayrikyan's Citizenship

NC2607115690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Review from the KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] ARMENPRES reports that the republic's Supreme Soviet once again studied the issue of restoring Baruyr Ayrikyan's citizenship during its session on 25 July. A commission that was formed for that purpose presented a [word indistinct] draft resolution to the session. After studying the resolution, the Supreme Soviet adopted a decision stating that Baruyr Ayrikyan's citizenship is restored as of 21 July 1988.

Debates also took place on the republic's Supreme Soviet provisional standing orders with proposals being put forward by the [word indistinct] committee and by deputies on various points and articles. It was decided to continue the debates on the standing orders (?on the next day).

On 25 July the deputies [words indistinct] (?the death of) renowed movie producer Sergey (Paradyanov).

Georgians Protest for Multiparty System

LD2707123190 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 27 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow July 27 TASS—Some 100 representatives of informal organisations and nearly 700 sympathisers staged a sit-down on the rails at Samtredia station [Georgia] to demand that the republican Supreme Soviet pass a law on a multiparty system at its extraordinary session.

The Soviet Interior Ministry reported that the strike halted traffic through the station, leaving 25 freight and eight passenger trains stranded on approaches to the city. The interior ministry is holding negotiations with the leaders of informal organisations to stop the action.

Aleksandr Rostovtsev, a Soviet Interior Ministry spokesman, said by phone that a strike began at the locomotive shed of the railway station in Sukhumi, the capital of Abkhazia, in support of the action in Samtredia.

Gumbaridze Views Sovereignty, Draft Laws

90US1134A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 24 Jun 90 pp 1, 2

[Report by G.G. Gumbaridze, chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, at the Special 15th Session of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation on 20 June 1990: "A Firm Legal Basis for Georgia's State Sovereignty"]

[Text] Dear deputies! Dear guests!

The present session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet is embarking on its work in an exceptionally important period of our social and political development. The cardinal renewal of all spheres of social life—the extension of the democratic process and the creation of a state based on the rule of law and the break with the command-administrative and bureaucratic structures—is not proceeding painlessly. Nor is this surprising: The old and moribund never voluntarily gives way to the new and progressive. This is an essential characteristic of our present day.

For this reason it is essential today that **each of us display maximum civic responsibility to the republic, recognize in full and in depth the truth, significance, and results of adopted decisions and comprehend well** how far they contribute to the present and future interests of the whole people and our republic, how far they take account of internal and external social and political situations and the regularities and prospects of their development and **how far they actually lead us toward political and economic sovereignty and the restoration and assertion of national statehood.**

This precisely is the paramount and principal task of our parliament and the republic leadership.

Each decision should be made so as to fully preclude emotions and opportunism and be imbued with the highest responsibility to posterity and our children. They will never excuse insufficient wisdom, short-sightedness, impetuosity, and sham experiments at the time of the solution of vitally important questions of Georgia's social and political development; just as they will not forgive us unless **we take steps, imbued with realism, but firm and specific,** for the restoration of Georgia's statehood.

It should be considered also that economically and socially the situation in the Soviet Union today is tense, complex, and politically serious. There are innumerable problems—socioeconomic stagnation, deterioration in living conditions, transition to the market economy, which will inevitably cause big difficulties, seriousness of interethnic relations, the extremely tense civil and political situation in the Baltic and Central Asian republics, neighboring Armenia and Azerbaijan and other regions, the difficult dismantling of the bureaucratic management structures, the abrupt increase in infringements of the law, social nihilism and such.

Under the conditions of this complex atmosphere an open political struggle between forces which are progressive and conservative and which have only just emerged on the scene of public life and which are comparatively inexperienced, but powerful and popular, is under way.

Revolutionary transformations are making a way for themselves arduously, not painlessly and not without casualties in East European countries also.

A whole spectrum of tension and contradictions has built up in Georgia as well. It is exacerbated by our geopolitical location; the extreme radicalism and maximalism of some social and political movements; the imbalance, as it were, in the interests of the representatives of different nationalities residing in the republic; the desire of part of society to solve all questions of national- state significance as quickly as possible, with a single wave of the hand; the complete or partial disregard for the so necessary realistic-forecast approach and serious gaps in the sphere of safeguarding legality and law and order; and, proceeding from this, the concern and fear even of society regarding a possible intensification of the social lack of protection and political destabilization.

To say nothing of the fact that one has a clear sense of the very low political culture of various groups of society, the absence of constructive dialogue, tolerance, cohesion, and morality and the aspiration to monopolism in the voicing of opinions, the expression of patriotism, and the exclusiveness and soundness of the chosen actions.

This today is the picture of the social and political situation, this is the reality, whether we like it or not. And we would be making a big mistake in closing our eyes to this or even embellishing the situation somewhat.

None of us, especially the leadership of the republic, has any right not to tell the people this loudly and dispassionately in order to felicitously lead our ship on the tempestuous sea of outwardly attractive emotions and appeals to an independent country which has restored its statehood, without physical and moral-ethical losses.

We do not have the right not to call for the sobermindedness and wisdom of all to whom the fate of Georgia and its future is not a matter of indifference; not to call primarily upon ourselves, for it is today's parliament and the republic leadership which are responsible for the situation which exists in Georgia and the fate of each person living here.

This high sense of responsibility must be shared by all of society, all its strata, workers and peasants, the intelligentsia, the youth and the social and political movements. I have to say plainly and openly: Without such individual and collective, civic responsibility to the republic, the onset of Georgia's bright future is, believe me, highly doubtful.

Despite the fact that for a year and a bit now we have not had practically even one more or less quiet week, we have been able, given understanding and support on the part of the bulk of the community, to localize and defuse several conflicts and situations close to catastrophe which had arisen in accordance with one and the same script now in one, now in another region of the republic. We have been able in such a way as to prevent the intervention of a third force. It should not be forgotten here that, because of well- known circumstances, in the sense of potential political destabilization Georgia is the most explosive republic.

We were, in the main, able to avoid a disastrous escalation of phenomena during the tragic events both within the republic and in neighboring republics. This is considerably to the credit of our people, all working people of the republic, the intelligentsia, and a multitude of social and political associations. In an exceptionally complex, tense atmosphere, when dramatic consequences even could not be ruled out and much was hanging by a thread, good sense and high responsibility to the people and to Georgia prevailed, nonetheless. So it must be today, tomorrow and in the future if we all really want peace in our long-suffering land and to move toward the shining goal by the correct, concerted, and secure path.

The Georgian Supreme Soviet has been operating in this tense atmosphere. At its sessions several important decisions for national sovereignty and the formulation of a constitutional mechanism for restoration of independent statehood, the profound democratization of the political, economic and social life of the republic, protection of human rights and the affirmation of humane ideals common to all mankind have been adopted at its sessions.

We should cite among such important laws and decrees:

alterations and additions to the Georgian Constitution, which recognize the preeminence of republic laws over Union laws; the decree on guarantees of the defense of Georgia's sovereignty, which recognized as illegal and invalid the treaty of union between the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] of 21 May 1921, and also the treaty of union on the creation of the union of Transcaucasus Soviet Socialist Republics of 12 March 1922.

This decree, however, observes: to begin negotiations on the restoration of the independence of the state of Georgia inasmuch as the 30 December 1922 treaty on the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is illegal in respect of Georgia. I will go on to report that **such negotiations have essentially begun**.

An objective political and legal evaluation of the violation of the treaty between Georgia and Soviet Russia of 7 May 1920, **thanks to which not only was the historical truth finally restored and honor done to the historical memory of the people but the legal foundations for the restoration of Georgian statehood were prepared, was made back last November**.

The alteration made at the republic Supreme Soviet session to **Articles 6, 7, and 49 of the Georgian Constitution opened the way to the establishment in our society of real political pluralism and elections of authorities on a multi-party basis**. It must be noted that, as distinct from the other republics, it is in Georgia that this October really democratic, multi-party elections will be conducted for the first time.

Other important bills and decrees have been adopted also.

Strenuous work is being performed by the Georgian Supreme Soviet Presidium and the commissions and groups which were formed. Specialists of the appropriate sectors, experts, and representatives of our scientific and artistic intelligentsia and public associations are participating vigorously in their activity.

Commissions and groups of the Supreme Soviet are working intensively to complete a whole package of bills, which are laying a firm foundation for the full political and economic sovereignty of Georgia, the restoration of its statehood, and the creation of a democratic society based on the rule of law. Some of them have been presented for examination by today's session.

Work will be completed shortly also on questions of the humanization of conditions in places of confinement, mitigation of punishment for a whole number of categories of convicts, release, amnesty, and an appreciable reduction in the number of applications of capital punishment.

I will dwell briefly on the issue of the convening of today's session. The deputies are well aware, and this has been announced officially, that a session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet was envisaged in the latter half of July, with today's agenda, in the main.

At the same time the deputies also know that the urgent convening of the session was demanded by the participants in the action at the university, with whom we have met repeatedly. Bringing forward the convening of the session was supported by the Academy of Sciences, the Journalists Union, and many other organizations. We conferred repeatedly with the deputies and members of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and representatives of all strata of society and our intelligentsia and decided jointly, with regard for public opinion, to bring forward the scheduled timing of the session by a month.

I have to report to the session today that in the opinion of the leaders of the commissions and working groups and also highly qualified experts who were invited, and I share their opinion, some bills have not, because of the lack of time, been put in final shape. This should not, I believe, be a hindrance to their examination. Let us discuss together and think together about perfecting them.

I say all this so that everyone may clearly comprehend the exceptionally complex and strained conditions under which we are operating, what we have been able to do, and what not, and what efforts and endeavors are necessary for each specific step and for the preparation of sure foundations for the success of the common cause. Despite all this, it should be said also by way of self-criticism that we must do a great deal at the proper time and with great diligence.

This points once again to the fact that for the achievement of our common goals great significance is attached to a stable, tranquil social and political situation, an atmosphere of benevolence and mutual assistance, concern for the solution of national problems, and consensus of national interests both in our republic and throughout the country.

In our political and legislative activity we have to take stock of the overall atmosphere throughout the world, interstate relations, the main trends of socioeconomic and social progress and Georgia's geopolitical position.

Georgia has never been isolated from the outside world and has had its historical relations and interests with countries of Europe and Anterior Asia, with Russia, and others. Nor has the situation with us and our political, social, and economic orientation been or is it now a matter of indifference for these countries. For this reason each step of ours is carefully weighed from the external aspect also, and the appropriate plans, which may not always be helpful to Georgia and may not always correspond to its aspirations and charted goals, are drawn up also.

Such a most ancient people and most rich culture and history as ours must take maximum account of the lessons of history. We have to recall the great Ilya here. He said: The decline of a nation begins when it forgets its history.

And, of course, it is necessary in our legislative activity, when we take actual steps toward economic and political independence, to take stock of the processes of the democratization of economic, political, and social life, which are developing exceptionally dynamically in the country and which are frequently characterized by contradictions and complications, and the new trends and radical changes in political thinking in the center and in the republics, as also the firmly preserved and strong power conservatism.

A sober view should be taken of these phenomena inasmuch as, despite the first steps on the way to independence, we are still a component of the administrative-command, bureaucratic system of a unitary state, albeit one in the process of being dismantled. This is where the need to withdraw in such a way as only to benefit and to lose nothing of significance comes from. Inasmuch as real sovereignty and independence mean only a situation where others depend on us, not we on others.

We consider a promising, important example of modern political thinking the recent statement of the president of the country at a meeting of the Council of the Federation and his idea, which elicited great international comment, that what is on the agenda is the creation of a free alliance of sovereign states and that it is necessary to take specific steps toward this in good time, which poses in a qualitatively new manner the question of the status of the republics. Military-diplomatic union and also equal, free economic relations in mutually profitable spheres are to represent the main sphere of this alliance. It was noted also that a differentiated approach to each republic with maximum consideration for its historical, cultural, and political development and traditions and its current social and political aspirations is essential.

We declared at the meeting of the Council of the Federation that the actual political situation today is changing very rapidly and that a prompt, sound, and sure political forecast is needed for, after all, even the very concept of federation has already been compromised; many old and new Union laws are complicating the situation in the republics; these laws are actually being disregarded; a standardized approach to the national-state arrangement of nations with different histories and cultures is unacceptable; and that the interests of Georgia with the nature of its political and historical past and political and legal relations with Russia do not coincide with the requirements of other republics. We said also that it is necessary to begin immediately and in parallel the equal negotiations of the republics with one another and with the center. We have in this connection already met with the leaders of Russia, Kazakhstan, the Central Asian republics, Moldavia, and the Baltic and other republics. Good, specific prospects are emerging.

I consider it very important also that we unfailingly consider the lessons of other republics.

We often hear, say, let us take the example of this republic or the other and act similarly. We greet all who are struggling for self-determination inasmuch as this is the sacred right and aspiration of each people, ours included. But I think, you will agree, that such vitally important issues need to be decided not by means of referenda, blockades, and moratoriums but constructively, through the political negotiations of equal parties and legally.

Each country, Georgia too, of course, has negotiated and has to negotiate its own unique historical path. This is only the path of Georgia, conditioned by the culture of the people and their political and economic history, mentality and customs, traditions, interethnic relations, and geopolitical location; it is a distinctive, particular, and unique path.

I have already said that this path has today emerged more distinctly. **Georgia's political and economic independence and the restoration of its statehood are becoming increasingly real with every passing day. It is this which is our main goal, and we would like to declare this precisely and unambiguously one more time. The next steps of significance should be taken in this direction at today's session also.**

I have made this lengthy, but, I believe, necessary, introduction so that each of us might display the maximum farsightedness and responsibility when it is being decided what should be supported, and what not, and we must be responsible for the result of each decision and each clause of a decision for they affect, after all, our entire people, the republic, the autonomous formations, the interests of the representatives of various peoples which live here, and our nation's tomorrow and its fate and future.

I have no doubt that with regard for the pleasure and desire of the whole people the session will adopt only such decisions as deprive the destructive, antidemocratic forces of any basis for inciting destabilization; will ensure the unity of interests of different strata of society, national concord and civil peace; will bring us closer by the constitutional, legal path to the restoration of Georgia's statehood; and will lay the foundation for building a democratic, humane, law-based society in an atmosphere of political pluralism.

It may be said without exaggeration that the attention of our entire community is focused on today's special session. The session is to formulate dependable guarantees of the defense of the full state sovereignty of Georgia and make an objective political and legal evaluation of a whole number of fundamental decisions adopted in the past which cardinally altered the arterial line of state life and the development of the Georgian people.

And, what is most important, our people expect from today's session that it will examine, with regard for current realities, new legislative instruments which should create firm foundations for the political, economic, and social structures of the republic and the processes of an extension of the democratization of our entire social life.

The interest of the Communist Party, other social and political movements and parties, and the entire community in stimulating the activity of the Supreme Soviet and its deputies, Presidium, and working components is entirely natural and normal. **The Supreme Soviet can and should be a flexible and dynamic mechanism for the consolidation of all healthy public forces and the assurance of national consensus.** This is particularly important now, when society and the people are gradually freeing themselves from totalitarian thinking, when a dismantling of the structures of the administrative-command system is actively under way and when the foundations of state relations are being laid.

As already mentioned, the Georgian Supreme Soviet has officially already made a political and legal evaluation of the violation of the treaty between Soviet Russia and the Georgian Democratic Republic of 7 May 1920, recognizing that military interference (intervention) and occupation for the purpose of the overthrow of the existing political system, which meant in fact annexation, occurred in Georgia in February-March 1921.

Many treaties which for the purpose of creating a so-called federation "of the new type" were at one time concluded by Georgia with the Russian Federation and neighboring Soviet republics—Azerbaijan and Armenia—which initiated the encroachment on the sovereign rights of the Georgian people and the virtual abolition of what was formally left of sovereignty by legal means, were declared illegal and invalid in this connection.

The objective evaluation of the events of the past showed that in Georgia the new authorities—initially revolutionary committees then soviets based on class, proletarian dictatorship—were established by outside forces.

For this reason it is perfectly logical that the appropriate legal evaluation be made of these phenomena.

Today the Supreme Soviet must first and foremost evaluate in principle the enactments of the Georgian Revolutionary Committee by which this unelected body announced to the Georgian people the seizure of power and the establishment of the soviet system. Proceeding from this, it is necessary to recognize as illegal all the enactments which abolished the political institutions of the Georgian Democratic Republic. We refer primarily to the elimination of the Constituent Assembly and judicial system.

But at the same time it should be emphasized also that while it is true that the political system of the soviets emerged with the aid of outside forces, as a result of the flagrant violation of contemporary international law on the part of Russia, without consideration of the sovereign will of the Georgian people, this legal evaluation should not call into question the legitimacy of the present state structures and institutions of Georgia. Such a conclusion would be mistaken and incompetent. Realism, the political history of the world, the constitutional development of Western countries included, and the present situation testify that state and law are often not a consequence of justice and true law. But, as a rule, the natural result of the solution of a whole range of problems of political, economic, and social development in this specific historical situation or the other.

The current authorities in Georgia, despite the nature of the principles of their formation are the political mechanism which exists both de jure and de facto and are entirely in keeping with the generally recognized rules of international law and present social and political realities.

Today the Georgian Supreme Soviet is the sole body which, proceeding from current realities, may legally create and strengthen the legal and political safeguards necessary for the restoration of Georgia's state independence, which should primarily be expressed in the election of a truly democratic, multi-party parliament.

The Supreme Soviet's fundamental position on the restoration of national and state sovereignty should primarily be considered confirmation that Georgia is using its legally enshrined authority to replace the insufficiently democratic political system with political-legal and economic structures built on genuinely democratic principles. Everyone who loves Georgia and who is concerned for its future should, regardless of his political views, attempt to achieve this goal peacefully and legally. And without the legislative activity of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet this is impossible.

Such is our opinion on the first item on the agenda and the decree prepared in respect of it.

Now about the second item on the agenda—the creation of a legal mechanism for the restoration of Georgia's state independence. It is essential here on the basis of national concord to devise a legal mechanism which affords an opportunity for the creation of a firm legal basis for the full realization of the constitutional guarantees of the sovereignty that has already been achieved and its further strengthening and extension and the successful continuation of the cause of building statehood.

And profoundly conceived, qualified work is needed for this. The unification of the efforts not only of the deputies but also of representatives of political parties, social and political organizations and mass movements, and highly qualified scholars and specialists of various branches is essential.

We believe it essential to create in just such a composition a **parliamentary commission which will draw up a specific staged program for the creation of a mechanism for the restoration of statehood and its realization**. It is this that is implied by the draft decree on the second item on the agenda which has been distributed among you.

The third item on the agenda. It concerns the bill of Georgian citizenship, work on whose preparation is entering the concluding phase.

Together with the group of deputies formed by the Constitutional Commission representatives of the All-Georgia Rustaveli Association, the unions, various youth associations, the People's Front and standing commissions and working groups under the auspices of the Supreme Soviet and the Ministry of Justice and legal experts participated actively in the elaboration of the bill.

The basic concept of this significant document elaborated on the basis of a comparison of various alternative versions and consideration of the results of debate and public opinion, with regard for the specific singularities of Georgia and the rules of international law included, is a definition of the rules of recognition of and admission to citizenship of the Georgian republic and alterations thereto and termination thereof. These are precisely the issues whose lack of legal regulation is causing a disruption of the migration balance and becoming a subject of public anger.

The independent determination of the rules of recognition of and admittance to citizenship is a significant manifestation of the republic's sovereignty. Georgia, as an independent state, must itself decide in all fullness and volume all questions connected with republic citizenship. The concept of the future bill should be based on the practice of both domestic and international law. None of its provisions must conflict with the rules which are generally recognized in a civilized society in the sphere of human rights, and they should at the same time take account of the specific singularities which should characterize citizenship of the republic.

The draft should consistently defend the principle of the full constitutional equivalence of citizens of the republic and at the same time institute for citizens of our republic

the preferential specific rights and corresponding duties stipulated by the constitution and other laws of Georgia.

At the same time, however, it should take account of the complete voluntary nature of determination of citizenship by persons who are permanent residents of our republic.

The Citizenship Act is a fundamental legislative instrument. Haste in its elaboration is impermissible. As the experience of some other republics shows, this causes nothing but harm.

In accordance with the proposal of the working group, the bill will in the very near future be distributed among the deputies, experts, and specialists, and the interested state and public organizations and associations. The text of the document, edited with regard for their observations and proposals, will be submitted to the Supreme Soviet for the adoption of the appropriate decision.

As you know, the fourth item on the agenda of our session **concerns democratic, multi-party elections**.

At the present stage the rate of social and political development has accelerated appreciably. Each of us can see full well how radically and rapidly the political, economic, and social aspect of our society and its traditional values and ideas are changing, how the processes of democratization and glasnost are intensifying and how political pluralism and actual multi-party conditions are becoming established.

The deputies are well aware that at the last session of the republic Supreme Soviet we legislatively recognized the principle of a multi-party system in electoral relations. It was for the actual implementation of this principle that the Supreme Soviet deferred the elections scheduled for 25 March.

Time has proven in full that this was a perfectly correct decision. Our people and our society now have every opportunity to ensure that the elections be democratic, general and, what is most important, multi-party, and that maximum account be taken of the experience of civilized countries and of our own also. We are also convinced of the soundness of the decision adopted earlier by the atmosphere which has been created in the Union republics where elections were conducted in accordance with the traditional pattern. Today they are encountering serious difficulties because of the constitutionally recognized multi-party system, and demands are already actually being heard for the elections to be held all over again, on a multi-party basis.

All this has made necessary the thorough elaboration and enactment of a new law on the election of deputies of the Georgian Supreme Soviet. The main purpose of the law should be the assurance of general, democratic, multi-party elections.

It should be noted that the republic Supreme Soviet and its Presidium and scholars, specialists, political parties, and movements of the republic are displaying great interest in the elaboration of an election law which accords all healthy political forces operating in the republic legal guarantees of democratic, multi-party elections. The Supreme Soviet already has versions and concepts of the first preliminary outlines of such a bill. Separate mention should be made here of the contribution of the "Democratic Elections in Georgia" (DASI) public organization. As a result of consultations with social and political organizations it has proposed several models of multi-party elections.

The elaboration of the most desirable electoral system, with regard for the level of the political-legal preparation of our society, has become essential. There was to this end in the Supreme Soviet, in the days preceding the session, intensive consultative work with the participation of interested sides, various parties, and social and political associations and experts. There was a free exchange of opinions and a comparison of them at the daily discussions. The work that was done showed that the consolidation of the legal consciousness of the interested parties in electoral relations is perfectly possible. Definite agreement on the basic principles of general, multi-party elections was reached. Political parties and social and political organizations and also citizen action committees will have the right to participate in elections by submitting so-called applications (petitions).

It is proposed that the political parties, public and political organizations, and mass movements submit to the precinct electoral commissions and the mass media a common list by district of the candidates for deputy whom they have nominated in order to notify the electorate.

The alternative opinion has been expressed to the effect that the elections should be conducted according to a mixed system, that is, some deputies would be elected by the majority system (the deputies know this system, we believe: This is in fact the system by which elections have been held here, in the form of so-called single-seat district nomination), others, through a proportional system. This latter implies the submission by political parties, public and political organizations, and mass movements of all-party lists. In this case the voter would be voting not for this individual or the other personally but for this party or the other and the list of candidates which it has submitted.

True, our generation is having to enact a law on general, democratic, multi-party elections in our republic and to conduct elections in accordance with this law for the first time, but it should not be forgotten that our people already have certain experience in enacting such a law and holding elections.

Together with many other innovations, certain experience in preparing and realizing multi-party elections was accumulated in the Georgian Democratic Republic. The regulations governing election of the republic Constituent Assembly afforded the Georgian population an opportunity to express its attitude toward the political

parties, organizations, and groups. The highest representative organ of supreme power of the Democratic Republic, which adopted the instrument on Georgia's independence, formed the government of the republic, and approved the national constitution and state symbols of the Georgian Democratic Republic, was created in this way.

It is now indisputable that the 1918 election regulations were extraordinarily progressive for that time. Democratic, multi-party elections were conducted in Georgia for the first time, the highest organs of people's power were formed with all-around consideration of the people's wishes, and a constitutional system was legally grounded on that basis.

All this played a big part in the history of Georgia's political development and the formation de jure of its state structure.

The following position was formulated at consultative meetings in respect of the bill—**to determine a Georgian Supreme Soviet election day and to schedule elections for 28 September 1990**.

The election law will be based on the principles of the universal, democratic, and multi-party approach. It will be drawn up with regard for both the proportional and majority electoral systems and will after a certain length of time be published for general discussion in the expectation that the Supreme Soviet might enact it in final form within approximately a month. It was with regard for this position that the draft decree in respect of this item of the agenda was drawn up.

The elaboration of the draft law on public organizations and political associations is directly connected with the cardinal revision and improvement of the current election law, with regard for the new realities. Of course, without perestroyka, the democratization of public life, and the surmounting of ideological dogmatism, the mere formulation even of the question of the creation of such a bill would have been impossible.

One of our main tasks is to provide for the consolidation of the various social currents and groups which are setting as their goal the expression and defense of the fundamental interests of our people, the national movement, all of Georgia and all its inhabitants.

This is no easy matter, of course. The social organism is becoming increasingly complex and diverse, and various schools, including social and political forces which are the polar opposites of one another, are manifesting themselves intensively.

In Georgia, as in other republics, various political movements have emerged in the political arena and declared themselves political parties. The activity of individual independent formations expressing the positions and interests of different strata of our society is becoming increasingly politicized.

Of course, society is interested in the development of the creative initiative and political assertiveness both of individual persons and groups and associations of them and their extensive participation in the running of the state and society. It is for this reason that guarantees of the free creation of political parties and other public and political associations are being created, which, for its part, puts on the agenda the task of legal regulation of their organization and activity.

Today all can see that the alteration of Articles 6, 7, and 49 of the Georgian Constitution has opened the way to the establishment in society of real pluralism and the organization of elections of the organs of state power on a multi-party basis. At the same time it is clear also that these new relations require the corresponding legislative regulation.

In the days prior to the session thoughts concerning political associations were examined with the participation of representatives of political parties. It was said that under no circumstances should preparatory work on the enactment of a law be speeded up artificially. It should be elaborated thoroughly and submitted for examination by the next session. The draft of this decree has been distributed among the deputies. It is acceptable, we believe, that the draft law on citizens' public associations, including political parties, mass movements, labor and artistic unions, voluntary societies, and associations, be congruent with the law on the election of deputies of the Georgian Supreme Soviet.

As far as the registration of parties on a legal basis is concerned, in the opinion of scholars, specialists, and representatives of political parties and public movements, this is not necessary for participation in elections. The basic propositions which imply the holding of multi-party elections may be considered in this law, and parties wishing to participate in elections may be registered in accordance with other rules.

Among the legal documents concerning the assurance of Georgia's real sovereignty, we attach particular significance to the bill on the principles of Georgia's economic independence, which is to create firm guarantees of the republic's independent economic development and its self-sufficient functioning, which has evoked the public's vital interest of late.

It should be said that intensive work is being performed in the republic in this area. The basic principles of Georgia's economic independence, which were published in the press last year, have been determined. A model of an independently functioning Georgian economy has been shaped on the basis of an analysis of the proposals and observations expressed in the press during the discussion of similar documents drawn up by the all-Georgian Rustaveli Society and various groups of economists and also with regard for the experience of the Baltic republics. Its basic essence is reflected in concentrated form by the bill on the fundamentals of Georgia's

economic independence submitted to the present session by the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers.

This document is based on such fundamental principles as the sovereignty of the republic, the exclusiveness and distinctiveness of its ownership, and the integrity of its national economic complex. Of no less significance is the fact that all forms of ownership, private included, acquire legal guarantees. The basic components of the republic's national wealth—land, its interior and other natural resources—are recognized as Georgia's inalienable property. Enterprises and facilities of sectors of the national economic complex become republic property. Free enterprise and self-government and self-financing, which will be combined with state control by predominantly economic methods, is declared the basic principle of management of the economy.

Also highly significant are the provisions concerning the formation of an independent budget-payments and finance and credit system. Enterprises located on Georgian territory will pay exclusively republic and local taxes.

The bill formulates anew, with regard for Georgia's natural-historical particulars, features the basic principles of independent policy in the spheres of demography, intra-republic and regional relations, the culture and spiritual life of society, and the ecology and use of nature. The basic approaches to questions of science and technology, structural and investment policy, and also foreign economic relations have been determined.

In parallel with this basic document bills are being drawn up on property, land and land use, leasing and leasing relations, the tax system, management of the economy and the social sphere, local self-government and the local economy, the banks and monetary circulation, financial autonomy, the self-financing and self-government of the autonomous republics, budget rights of Georgia, the autonomous republics, the autonomous oblast and the local soviets, the defense of culture and social rights, public education, social security, state control of the economy, prices, enterprises and joint-stock companies, ministries and state committees, accountability to state authorities, the bankruptcy of enterprises and organizations, social insurance, health care and nature conservation, water and water use, the interior and the use of its resources, and city planning. This package of laws should provide for the creation of a precise mechanism for the functioning of Georgia's independent economy.

The proposal that the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers be instructed to elaborate, in connection with the enactment of the Georgian SSR law on the fundamentals of economic independence of the Georgian SSR, measures pertaining to its staged realization, if, of course, this bill is adopted today, is submitted.

A bill on such an acute issue for all of us as alternative service and legal regulation of the problems associated with it has been submitted for examination by our present session. It allows for all citizens of our republic who because of their pacifist, religious, or other beliefs refuse compulsory military service to perform (labor) service alternative to it. The corresponding law should determine its basic legal and social mechanism. A bill on this question has been submitted for examination at the session. It is based on the principles of civil and labor law and is unconnected with the armed forces and or other militarized organizations. The bill clearly determines the list of persons who may be called for alternative service and at the same time determines the list of conditions whereby a citizen is exempted from such service.

The principle of the call-up for alternative service of trainees of secondary vocational-technical institutions and students of higher educational institutions, the establishment of deferred terms and the timeframe of alternative service and a reduced term of service, the times of training, and other call-ups and social guarantees of citizens who have performed alternative service and their rights and duties are highly important also.

It is necessary to determine the kind of body which will exercise the call-up for alternative service—whether new structures are formed or existing ones used. We need to determine the sectors of the economy in which it will be possible to use the labor-obligated citizens.

The elaboration of a bill on alternative service requires the implementation of serious measures and their specific realization. It is essential to take account of both the requirements of the Georgian Constitution and the experience of foreign countries. The document submitted for examination by the session is the fruit of the joint efforts of the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the Ministries of Justice and Finance, the Legal Faculty of the Tbilisi State University imeni Ivane Dzhavakhishvili, working groups of the Supreme Soviet, and representatives of other interested organizations.

The law on alternative service must cater for Georgian citizens' constitutional rights. It is therefore necessary, upon the adoption of this document, to take account of all legal provisions and details. This will make it possible to avoid mistakes, which, unfortunately, we are still making frequently in the hasty adoption of various documents. The Latvian parliament, incidentally, was the first to enact a law on alternative service, but it is still not working inasmuch as all the necessary details were not taken into consideration in its preparation.

A draft Supreme Soviet decree determining the procedure for commissioning such service and instructing the Georgian SSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems to draw up a list of the work of which society is in particular need (construction, transport, municipal services, health care) and also tasks pertaining to the elimination of the consequences of catastrophes and natural or ecological disasters on which citizens should work when performing alternative (labor) service has been prepared in respect of the alternative service bill. The decree takes into account the allocation by the

Council of Ministers of the necessary resources for financing these measures and also the elaboration of provisions concerning the procedure and conditions for the performance of alternative (labor) service.

Now about item eight on the agenda—**evaluation of certain USSR laws based on Article 77 of the Georgian Constitution**. It is necessary to call attention to one highly significant circumstance here. The USSR Supreme Soviet has recently been working with great intensity on the elaboration and adoption of new laws. These documents frequently lack a preparatory base, and many fundamental provisions are in need of clarification. It transpires that the USSR Supreme Soviet is attempting to forestall one expected phenomenon or another and subordinate the development of natural objective processes to its influence.

What is particularly disturbing is the enactment of laws which manifestly ignore not only the already quite inadequate state sovereign competence of the Union republics and their national sovereignty but which also disregard enactments which the Union authorities themselves even consider prescriptive, fundamental documents of the creation of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Deputies! A draft decree of the republic Supreme Soviet and material on the USSR laws which, proceeding from Georgia's sovereign interests, are in need of objective evaluation has been distributed among you. **We refer first and foremost to laws which infringe the right of the free secession of the Union republics from the USSR and which interfere in rights within the internal jurisdiction of Georgia and the other Union republics** which are inviolable according to the treaty on the formation of the Soviet Union, that treaty which the Union authorities consider to be in effect even today.

The laws which encroach on Georgia's economic sovereignty, impede the implementation of reforms which are necessary for and specific to our republic and threaten our people's well-being are unacceptable also.

The USSR Supreme Soviet has been taking insufficiently into account in its legislative activity the processes occurring in the Union republics and, in addition, has frequently displayed unitarist aspirations. The draft decree proposed in respect of this item of the agenda contains, in our opinion, guarantees of the defense of Georgia's sovereignty precisely against such unacceptable laws.

It is here that we would like to reflect our position in respect of the political processes occurring in the Baltic republics. We fully understand the aspiration of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian peoples, as also of the Russian, Ukrainian, and any other people, to restore their state sovereignty and independence. This aspiration is sacred and inviolable, and no one has the right to flout it. Disagreements between the Union and the republics must be resolved not by ultimatums, blockade, moratoriums, and confrontation but only by political dialogue and constructive cooperation.

We believe that the draft statement of the Supreme Soviet apropos the Baltic republics correctly reflects our attitude toward the said question.

The path leading to restoration of Georgia's statehood is highly complex and contradictory. We are obliged to negotiate this segment of our people's historical path in civilized manner, without material, physical, and, most importantly, spiritual losses. Responsibility for this should be shared fully by the whole community, public and political organizations, mass movements, and official and unofficial structures. We must all bear this honorable national cross.

We must restore statehood exclusively by the legal path, we must occupy our place in the world family exclusively by the legal path. We will not create a law-based Georgia, whose ideal will be values common to all mankind, civil, national peace, and equilibrium and the principles of democratization and humanism, by unlawful methods.

The bills submitted for examination by our present session and the decrees which the Supreme Soviet will adopt in respect of them should create the legal levers which will bring closer the national, nationwide goal.

As observed earlier, specialists of various branches, experts, ministries, and departments of the republic and representatives of public organizations, mass movements, and our community participated actively in the elaboration of these bills. This showed graphically **what great intellectual and moral potential is being set in motion by the pluralism of opinions, constructive cooperation, benevolent dialogue, and respect for the position of one's opponent** and all his objective arguments.

It is essential to adopt a solicitous attitude toward our common achievements. This will afford an opportunity for the adoption of the optimum, most correct decisions. The laws and other legislative enactments, drawn up by common efforts and common endeavors, should be distinguished by high professionalism and competence, precision and scale, and a clear-cut vision of the future.

The significant legislative enactments and decisions adopted recently graphically testify that our Supreme Soviet has sharply turned about to confront acute national problems. All this is creating the conditions for **converting the Supreme Soviet into a genuinely national assembly** in which it is possible, in a peaceful, professional and cordial atmosphere, to constructively examine and resolve the most urgent problems confronting Georgia.

The Supreme Soviet should have as its highest and most important goal **the achievement of national consensus for the good of our people and the representatives of all peoples which live in Georgia and it must unfailingly achieve this great national goal**.

Gumbaridze Receives Regional Party Chiefs

LD2607201690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] The results of the 28th CPSU Congress were the subject of meetings between Gumbaridze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, with first secretaries of gorkoms [city party committee] and raykoms [rayon party committee] of the republic's communist party. It was stated at the meetings that the time remaining before the second stage of the republican congress must be used to the full for collective work on the drafts of the program and normative documents and the preelection platform which will be approved at the congress, since what is at stake is not only party interests, but also the future of Georgia and the choice of a path for many decades to come.

Caucasus Shootings, Arms Seizures, Explosion Seen

LD2607113790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] On 24 July, inhabitants of the settlement of (Baryemakamavan) working in the fields of the settlement in the Noyemberyanskiy Rayon were fired on from the Kazakhskiy Rayon of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. As a result, one of them was wounded and has been hospitalized.

On 25 July, in the Sisianskiy Rayon of Armenia, a band of 50 armed men broke into the building of the rayon internal affairs organ where, threatening to use weapons, they seized three rifles, three carbines and 2,500 cartridges, two signal pistols, the special agent Cheremukha ["bird cherry tree," also the name of a type of nerve gas], bulletproof vests, and radio sets.

The same day, in the town of Kafan in Armenia, unknown persons threw an explosive device at the monument to Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. The monument was slightly damaged by the explosion.

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Interviewed on Kazakh Affairs

90US1146A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 90 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Kazakh SSR, by A. Olegov; place, date not given: "The Watchword Is Consolidation!"]

[Text] [Olegov] Nursultan Abishevich, what kind of mood, what kind of parting wishes from the Kazakhs did you bring to Moscow for the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Nazarbayev] Many things trouble us: The events taking place in the Baltic and Transcarpathian regions, aggravation of interethnic relations, mob passions, and the decline in the standard of living. But their most important parting wish was to preserve the unity of the country and the party.

The political situation in Kazakhstan is stable today. To a great degree this is explained by the economic achievements noted in the republic over the last four years. For instance, production of meat has grown by almost 25 percent, and output of consumer goods has doubled. We completed our five-year targets for the construction of apartments back in March, and the republic's residents will receive about 7 million square meters of housing above that which has been promised. We have erected significantly more recreation and public health facilities. And people have already been affected by it. And keep in mind that we do not restrict access of outsiders to our stores even though we know how many tons of food are being sent in packages from Alma-Ata to other republics. We do not even put up barriers to the other oblasts on the borders.

How do we resolve the food problem? The private sector is very helpful. There is more livestock in the private yards. We sell meat purchased from the population in the cooperative stores. These exist in all the oblast centers and in many of the cities.

But of course we should not be too optimistic. Even in Kazakhstan there is not yet abundance. And how can there be if a third of the meat being produced is delivered to the Union fund? And what do we get in exchange? We are troubled by the economy's lack of balance. Even the enterprises producing consumer goods cannot get deliveries of raw materials. As a result the idea of economic sovereignty for the republic is becoming very timely.

[Olegov] The most timely appeal today is for consolidation. Is it possible?

[Nazarbayev] We have studied the platforms and trends in the party attentively. If you look at it objectively, all of them in my opinion have points of contiguity. In fact, the representatives of all the platforms have made it their goal to improve the life of the people, and no one has spoken against perestroyka. And these are basic principles upon which consolidation is possible. And therefore we need to move from ambition to the discovery of common points of view and common solutions. We should not forget that with today's politicization and today's shortages of food and consumer goods a split in the party will turn into a split in society. That threatens us with monstrous consequences. And we need to remember something else: Arguments among communists will immediately be used by another political force which does not share communist ideals. That danger must not be underestimated. So we communists have no choice: Only unity which is on the basis of the renewal of the CPSU and its deep democratization, and a turn toward the needs of people and their interests. Only this way can we win the trust of the people.

[Olegov] Much depends on the decisions of the congress. And yet the fate of perestroyka is not in the meeting halls

of congresses—of the party or of people's deputies—but it is in the factories, collective and state farms, and scientific laboratories. And how is Kazakhstan working?

[Nazarbayev] I have already quoted some figures. And this is more or less the result of the fact that back in 1985 we undertook economic reform seriously. The index of the growth of output of industrial production immediately went up. However since 1988 the country has turned toward the side of active politicization. Economics were put on the back burner. We began to make hasty decisions and violated the correspondence between wages and labor productivity, and discipline was weakened. Elections of the directors of enterprises contributed to this: They began to elect directors who were easy on the collectives. What else can I say... mistake followed mistake. Now Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has informed us that the population's monetary income has grown over the last two years by R105 billion. How could that have been permitted? Where was the Ministry of Finance? Where was the State Planning Committee? Where was science? No increase in consumer goods can cover that mass of money any time soon. That is the problem. And how will this year end? The head of the government has not said anything about this. Today in Kazakhstan we have resources left for two and a half months of major construction. And what will happen afterward? Of course we will not allow the pace to fall, but the tendency toward a slump is alarming. This absolutely must be changed. By what and how? Yes, the market is part of the answer, but not the feudal market to which some of the scholars are calling us: A sack of wheat for two rams. The market must be created on the level of great competition, demonopolization, and on the basis of a law against monopolies. But what do they propose for us? Free prices and free enterprise. How can we transfer to a market with empty shelves? There has to be a state reserve. Is there one?

[Olegov] Nursultan Abishevich, I was recently in Kazakhstan and saw with my own eyes how peaceful Kazakhstan is. Are you in fact peaceful?

[Nazarbayev] If by peace you mean the absence of stormy mass meetings and all types of fronts, then I must disappoint you. We too have various currents and informal organizations. For instance there are societies to save the Aral Sea, to study the native language, etc. We are maintaining close ties with them. But groups have sprung up whose final goal is ethnic isolation. We are also talking with them. On principle. And on that level I am far from at peace. And their position will be strengthened if the measures we have taken do not raise the people's standard of living. But it can only be raised under one condition: Give the republic economic independence, and let us administer ourselves. Look: The country is living according to unknown laws. They have repudiated the old economic administration, but they have not created new levers. That is the whole problem. This is what we must look for. And we will look for it. The Kazakhs generally make us, not Moscow, responsible for the results.

The leaders of the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan gathered recently in Alma-Ata. We signed several documents: A declaration from the republics, an agreement on economic and cultural cooperation, and an appeal to all peoples concerning interethnic issues. Our goal is to provide the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan with a peaceful life. We concluded bilateral agreements on concrete things and coordinated economics. It was written down that our agreement is open to all the republics, even to foreign employers. We have concluded the same sorts of agreements with 10 of the oblasts of Russia. Negotiations are under way with Belorussia.

I believe that we have already begun to create approaches toward a new Union treaty.

[Olegov] Let us return to the congress. Of course it is still too early to speak about any deep conclusions. There are still eight days left. Nonetheless, what are your first impressions of the congress, the report, and the accounts?

[Nazarbayev] The beginning of the congress has shown that there is a critical mood, and a substantial one at that. The report was oriented toward candor—toward describing everything as it is. Although it seems to me that there are few clear ideological directions for party organizations and communists. But even today it is possible to say that we are consolidating ourselves at this congress and in this way we justify the hopes of the Soviet people.

[Olegov] The question of reinforcing the process of self-purification in the party has been discussed heatedly at the congress. How do you understand this process?

[Nazarbayev] I was pleased by the position of those delegates who justly criticized the leadership for the slow democratization of the party itself. We have fallen behind on this. It has not been happening from the top. Remember, there was an appeal: Begin from the bottom. That is the way it happened. And I am against purges, but we should use testimonials of communists and the changing of party documents in order to free ourselves of ballast. And we should give more rights to the primary party organizations. Who better knows its ballast than the primary organization?

Situation in Osh Reportedly Normalizing

LD2607162190 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 26 Jul 90

[Text] Frunze July 26 TASS-KIRTAG—Work continues in the Osh region to normalise and stabilise the situation. Elders of the Kirghiz and Uzbek communities met the leaders of the region in the village of Mady of the Kara-Sui district to sign an agreement to prevent interethnic conflicts and call upon all residents of the region to restore friendship between the two peoples.

People are resuming work. On Wednesday, 98 per cent of the region's transport and service workers reported for work. On the same day, four public catering facility heads were fined for the failure to ensure normal operation of the collectives they lead.

The leaders of the region and the republic continue meeting work collectives, elders and women of both nationalities in the Uzgen district.

Three male corpses were unearthed during construction work in the eastern part of the regional centre. Efforts are being made to identify the victims.

Over the past 24 hours, 43 happenings have been reported. Forty-two firearms have been seized and 170 people were detained for violating the curfew. Eighty-nine people are still missing, and the search for them continues.

Continuing Army Role in Kirghizia Questioned

PM2607205290 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jul 90 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel O. Vladykin report under the rubric "Osh Oblast: Political Situation": "Exclusion Zone"]

[Excerpts] Osh, Uzgen, Oktyabrskiy, and Frunze—[passage omitted] Since the first few days of July, the commander of the airborne troops, the defense minister, and later the country's leadership have been receiving appeals from servicemen in Kirghizia who consider the troops' continued presence in areas of mass uprisings and ethnic clashes to be inappropriate. Let me observe that these appeals have come from people the majority of whom carried out tasks apparently similar to today's tasks during the well-known events in Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Fergana. So what is the problem now?

To get to the bottom of the situation that has arisen, Colonel General V. Achalov, commander of the airborne troops, spent the whole of last week in Central Asia, in the places where the forces subordinate to him are currently located. This period coincided with the 40-day mourning period for the victims of the June clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks, and at the same time the central press and television began to spread alarming reports on a new exacerbation of the interethnic conflict in Osh Oblast. Thus an extremely clear answer to the question facing the commander was apparently at hand: The situation in the republic remains explosive, and the continued presence of the military contingent that was sent in is entirely justified. However, this same question arose again during the very first conference held by Col. Gen. Achalov at the headquarters of the airborne troops operations group in Osh.

Major General V. Sazykin, who heads the group, delivering his report on the situation in the regions under his control, noted: "Despite the considerable strength of MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] forces concentrated here, public order is mainly ensured by our troops. I regard this state of affairs as abnormal, because many functions that the local organs of power and law enforcement organs have distanced themselves from, are being handed over to us." The general backed up his conclusions with extensive documentation containing a detailed analysis of the situation in the republic from the moment of the outbreak of conflict until the present.

As in the other Central Asian republics, there are a great many acute social problems in Kirghizia: a shortage of housing (in Osh there are 12,000 families without housing) and jobs, serious deficiencies in the system of health care, education, and so forth. For decades these problems were not tackled. Yet world experience long ago uncovered a natural law: Irrespective of the geography of the emergence of such conditions, if they continue to be aggravated they will sooner or later provide the impetus for mass manifestations of national egotism. Seeing no other way to overcome difficulties in life, people not infrequently seek a solution in mutual assistance on the basis of nationality. At the expense, of course, of representatives of other peoples and ethnic groups who only recently did not provoke any complaints among their nearest neighbors. Events in Kirghizia provide new confirmation of this.

Since the local authorities were unable to guarantee in the foreseeable future the effective resolution of the acute socioeconomic problems in regions jointly inhabited by Kirghiz and Uzbek populations, certain informal organizations took the initiative. Springing up on the basis of a single nationality, they proclaimed their objective to be concern for the provision of housing and jobs and the revival of the customs and traditions of the people whose interests they had resolved to represent. As a result of the informals' uncompromising position, a dispute arose between them over a plot allocated for individual construction on irrigated land at the Lenin kolkhoz [collective farm] in Kara-Suyskiy Rayon. The dispute had its dramatic denouement on 4 June. Thousands of Kirghiz and Uzbeks, in an aggressive mood against each other, assembled on opposite sides of the disputed kolkhoz field. And although they were addressed by A. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, and M. Sherimkulov, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, a clash could not be prevented. It is well known how it ended for the republic and its inhabitants. More than 200 people died, about 1,500 were injured, and hundreds of homes and dozens of national economic facilities were set on fire.

And now that the irreconcilability of the informal movements representing the national groupings involved in the conflict is obvious, as is the strength of their influence among the population, the republic leadership has adopted a very unusual position.

Looking out of the window of the office of the Osh Obkom [oblast party committee] first secretary, where Col. Gen. V. Achalov, commander of the airborne

troops, was meeting with A. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, I could clearly see the square in front of the obkom building. Down there, beneath the burning Central Asian sun, in temperatures of 40 degrees, thousands of women stood for hours on end—only women. Their way to the building was barred by a cordon of armed soldiers, with some 30 meters of open space behind them. An exclusion zone, so to speak. And meanwhile, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, after describing in detail the disturbances that occurred in recent days and the progress of the investigation into the June events, concluded: "We should keep the airborne troops here, at least for a couple more months..."

Shouts wafted up from the square through the open window: "We want to talk with Sydykov. Let him come out to us." These appeals were aimed at the owner of the office, U. Sydykov, first secretary of the party obkom, who was right there. Evidently the women wanted to hear from him personally the answers to the questions they had written on their numerous placards: "Where is the truth?" "When will the murderers go on trial?" But the first secretary did not go to the women.

No, I am not idealizing the effectiveness of speeches by party and soviet leaders to excited participants in rallies and demonstrators. Especially somewhere where mass fighting, arson attacks on houses, and hostage-taking are continuing to this day. "Going to the people" is not likely to nullify the disturbances by itself. All the same, I have seen for myself that it is possible at least to alleviate the tension in disturbed areas by this means. [passage omitted]

Difficult as it may be, it is possible to cross the exclusion zone and look at the people without peering out from behind broad backs in flak jackets. True, it is far more difficult to regain their trust. But this has yet to happen, and the people who experienced the nightmare of the pogroms now also pin their hopes for a better future on... the paratroopers who surround the raykoms [rayon party committees] and ispolkoms [soviet executive committees]. [passage omitted]

No wonder, given that the idea of retaining the paratroopers was also actively supported in Frunze, the republic's capital, by Militia Colonel F. Kulov, Kirghiz SSR deputy minister of internal affairs. Recalling that problems are arising over stationing the troops being withdrawn from the East European countries, he promptly named several places where, in his opinion, the military could settle in very well. Col. Gen. V. Achalov thanked him for his concern for the needs of the Armed Forces, but observed that such questions are decided by the highest organs of power. "I think the proposal will get through up there. You are needed here as a deterrent," the militia colonel said.

Against whom are they recommending us to retarget the deterrent force of the Army, which is in general designed to rebuff aggression from outside? Lieutenant Colonel Ye. Kobozev, senior political worker with the Frunze airborne troops operations group, explained: "We are operating like militia details here. We go out on alerts in response to practically every drunken brawl in a restaurant. And also we are teaching the state motor vehicle inspectorate workers how to organize checkpoints on the roads and the procedure for searching motor vehicles...."

A curious situation, if I can put it like that. Despite the involvement of comparatively large forces from the USSR MVD and the USSR Prosecutor's Office to help the republic law enforcement organs, representatives of the local authorities and the population equally see a possibility of stabilizing the situation in the disturbed areas only in the permanent presence of the military. But is this not unnatural? And how long can such a situation go on? After all, the Army cannot resolve tasks that do not properly belong to it. The Army cannot build the housing that people are short of, create new jobs, or provide a proper legal regime for the population. So there will still be dissatisfied people, and the grounds for conflicts will persist. And then....

"Attempts are already being made to discredit the military," I was told in Uzgen by Colonel V. Yevnevich, chief of the airborne troops group there. "People are beginning to identify us with the authorities, and naturally to blame us for all the population's troubles. There are cases of people spitting in the faces of soldiers and officers, throwing stones at them.... What next?"

So is it not time to grasp the fact that you cannot go on endlessly looking toward the "center" and relying on the Army's help? That the responsibility for the situation in a given region should be borne first and foremost by the republican and local authorities?

'Special Order' Lifts Curfew in Dushanbe

LD2607161590 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 26 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Nina Merezhnikova]

[Text] Dushanbe July 26 TASS—The curfew and other restrictive measures were introduced in February after an extremist group sought to overthrow the lawful republican government by unconstitutional means. The situation was grave, replete with rioting, pogroms and interethnic clashes. A state of emergency was imposed on Dushanbe simultaneously with the curfew.

The situation has basically returned to normal over the past few months. According to the republican Interior Ministry's press centre, no interethnic conflicts have been reported lately. Football matches, attended by thousands of fans, are played at the city stadium. The recent celebration of the 1,400th birth anniversary of Borbad, father of the Tajic classical music, was attended by numerous guests from all over the country.

The improvement of the situation in the republic was promoted by the new law on liability for destabilising the

social and political situation, promulgated by the republican parliament. Four local residents have been indicted on charges of spreading malicious rumours. An Azeri woman, who incited nationalist feelings among Tajik youth, was also punished.

Security forces continue persecution of militants. More than 120 criminal proceedings have been instituted. Trials are open to the public and regularly covered by the press.

The leaders of unoffical organisations have repeatedly suggested lifting the curfew and the state of emergency. The proposal was considered during the recent session of the Tajik parliament.

The proposal was voted down by a majority. It was decided to lift the restrictions only after the instigators of the February unrest were named and punished.

The investigation is being conducted by the republican Interior Ministry and KGB staffers. They are assisted by colleagues from Moscow, Leningrad and other cities of the Soviet Union.

Uzbek Decree on Oversight Law Published

90US1150B Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 30 Jun 90 p 3

[Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet decree: "Procedure of Introduction of the Uzbek SSR Law 'Constitutional Oversight in the Uzbek SSR'"]

[Text] In connection with the enactment of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Law "On Constitutional Oversight in the Uzbek SSR" the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To introduce the Uzbek SSR Law "On Constitutional Oversight in the Uzbek SSR" as of 1 July 1990.

The provisions of the said law concerning supervision of the conformity of the Constitution and laws of the Karakalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] to the Constitution of the Uzbek SSR and the laws of the Uzbek SSR will take effect simultaneously with the alterations and additions to the section of the Uzbek SSR Constitution on the national-state and administrative-territorial arrangement of the Uzbek SSR. This exception does not extend to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee's exercise as of 1 July 1990 of supervision of prescriptive legal enactments concerning citizens' basic rights and liberties.

2. For the purpose of implementation of the principle of the replaceability of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee provided for by Article 6 of the Uzbek SSR Law "On Constitutional Oversight in the Uzbek SSR," to determine that immediately following the election of the first committee the committee chairman will determine by lots five committee members whose term of authority expires in five years. At subsequent elections each committee member is elected for a 10-year term.

3. On questions of the protection of labor rights and other conditions supporting their activity, persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee have equal status with Uzbek SSR people's deputies.

[Signed] M. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.
[Dated] Tashkent, 20 June 1990.

Uzbek Constitutional Oversight Law Passed

90US1150A Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 30 Jun 90 pp 2, 3

[Uzbek SSR Law "On Constitutional Oversight in the Uzbek SSR"]

[Text] I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1. **Purposes of constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR**

Constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is established for the purpose of ensuring the conformity of enactments of state authorities and public organizations to the Uzbek SSR Constitution, and in the Karakalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], to the Constitution of the Karakalpak ASSR, and protection of the constitutional rights and liberties of the individual and the rights of the peoples of the Uzbek SSR and the democratic foundations of Soviet society.

Article 2. **Constitutional oversight authorities**

Constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR is exercised by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, and in the Karakalpak ASSR, by the Karakalpak ASSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

Article 3. **Basic principles of the activity of the constitutional oversight authorities**

The constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR authorities operate on the basis of socialist legality, collegiality, and glasnost.

The constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR authorities are independent and subordinate only to the Uzbek SSR Constitution, and in the Karakalpak ASSR, to the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution.

No interference in the activity of the constitutional oversight authorities is permitted and entails liability in accordance with the law.

Article 4. **Legislation governing constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR**

The tasks, organization, and procedure of exercise of constitutional oversight in the Uzbek SSR are determined by the Uzbek SSR Constitution and this law, and in the Karakalpak ASSR, by also the Karakalpak ASSR

and the Karakalpak ASSR Law on Constitutional Oversight in the Karakalpak ASSR.

II. COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURE OF THE ELECTION OF THE UZBEK SSR CONSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Article 5. **Composition of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is elected from the ranks of specialists in the sphere of politics and law in the composition of a chairman, deputy chairman, and nine committee members, including a representative from the Karakalpak ASSR.

Article 6. **Election of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The chairman, deputy chairman, and members of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee are elected by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet for a 10-year term.

Proposals concerning the personal composition of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee are submitted to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet by the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

A person who has obtained a majority of votes of the total number of Uzbek SSR people's deputies is deemed elected.

For the purpose of ensuring continuity in the activity of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, half of it is replaced every five years.

The newly elected members of the committee assume office the day they are elected.

Article 7. **Oath of the persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet swears in the persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

The text of the oath is: "I solemnly swear to conscientiously fulfill the duties entrusted to me as a member of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee and to submit here to all provisions of the Uzbek SSR Constitution and none other."

Article 8. **Early termination of the authority of a person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The authority of a person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee may be terminated early upon his tendering of resignation; in accordance with his state of health preventing performance of his duties; in the event of violation of his oath and departure from the republic; in connection with a conviction in a court of law taking legal effect in respect of him.

A decision on the early termination of the authority of a person who is a member of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is adopted in accordance with a representation of the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

When the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet is not in session, the authority of a person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is suspended in the event of his violation of his oath or of a conviction of a court of law taking legal effect in respect of him. The decision on the suspension of authority is adopted by the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 9. **Supplementary election to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

In the event of the early departure of a person who was a member of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet elects additionally to the committee another person for the term of authority remaining.

In the event of the early departure of a person who was a member of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, the election of a new committee member to replace the person who has departed is not conducted if there is less than a year prior to the expiration of his authority remaining.

III. AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURE OF THE ACTIVITY OF THE UZBEK SSR CONSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Article 10. **Enactments under the supervision of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee examines questions concerning conformity to the Uzbek SSR Constitution of:

draft laws of the Uzbek SSR and other enactments submitted for examination by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

laws of the Uzbek SSR and other instruments adopted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

the Constitution of the Karakalpak ASSR.

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee exercises supervision of conformity to the Uzbek SSR Constitution and laws of the Uzbek SSR enacted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet of:

edicts of the president of Uzbek SSR;

decrees and ordinances of the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

laws of the Karakalpak ASSR;

decisions of local soviets of people's deputies;

ordinances and regulations of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers;

international treaty and other commitments of the Uzbek SSR submitted for ratification or approval;

directive explanations of a plenum of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court;

enactments of the chief state arbiter of the Uzbek SSR of an enforceable nature and also prescriptive legal enactments of other state authorities and public organizations in respect of which, in accordance with the Uzbek SSR Constitution, legality control by the procuracy is not exercised.

The supervisory functions of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee do not extend to convictions and other rulings of courts of law and decisions of the investigating authorities, the procuracy and the State Arbitration Tribunal pertaining to civil, criminal, administrative, and arbitration matters.

Article 11. **Examination of disagreements**

In the event of disagreements arising between the Uzbek SSR and the Karakalpak ASSR in connection with the constitutionality of enactments adopted by their organs of state power and administration, the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee examines these disagreements at the initiative of either party to the litigation in accordance with the rules determined by this law and the standing orders of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

Article 12. **Submittal of questions for examination by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee accepts a question for examination:

1) as instructed by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet—in respect of draft laws of the Uzbek SSR and other enactments submitted for examination by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

2) in accordance with the proposals of no less than one-fifth of Uzbek SSR people's deputies, the president of the Uzbek SSR, the chairman of the Uzbek SSR and the Karakalpak ASSR Supreme Soviet—in respect of laws of the Uzbek SSR and other instruments adopted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

3) as instructed by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet—in respect of edicts of the president of the Uzbek SSR;

4) as instructed by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and in accordance with the proposals of the president of the Uzbek SSR, the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and the Karakalpak ASSR Supreme Soviet—in respect of the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution and laws of the Karakalpak ASSR;

5) as instructed by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and in accordance with the proposals of no less than one-fifth of Uzbek SSR people's deputies, the president of the Uzbek SSR, the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and the Karakalpak ASSR Supreme Soviet—in respect of ordinances and regulations of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers and international treaty and other commitments of the Uzbek SSR;

6) as instructed by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and in accordance with the proposals of the president of the Uzbek SSR, the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, standing commissions of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, the Karakalpak ASSR Supreme Soviet, the Uzbek SSR People's Control Committee, the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court, the Uzbek SSR prosecutor, the Uzbek SSR chief state arbiter, republic bodies of public organizations, and the Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR—in respect of prescriptive legal enactments of other state authorities and public organizations in respect of which, in accordance with the Uzbek SSR Constitution, legality control by the procuracy is not exercised.

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has the right also on its own initiative to examine questions concerning conformity to the Uzbek SSR Constitution and Uzbek SSR laws of the enactments of the highest organs of state power and administration of the Uzbek SSR and other authorities formed or elected by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and also the decisions of local soviets of people's deputies.

If organs of state administration, judicial, procuracy and other security and law enforcement authorities, public organizations, and the citizens discover a discrepancy between the law or other legal provision and the Uzbek SSR Constitution, they bring this to the attention of the authority authorized to forward this question for examination by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has the right to reject individual instructions, proposals, and appeals as not being within its jurisdiction.

Article 13. **Acceptance of questions for examination on the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee's own initiative**

The chairman, deputy chairman, and members of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee have the right to submit a question for examination on the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee's own initiative.

The decision to examine a question is adopted by majority vote of the members of the committee participating in the meeting.

Article 14. **Chairman and deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The chairman of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee exercises overall leadership of the work of the committee, convenes meetings thereof on his own initiative or in accordance with a proposal of no less than

three committee members, presides at it, and also performs other functions entrusted to him by this law.

As authorized by the chairman of the committee, the deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee performs the former's functions and deputizes for him in his absence or in the event of it not being possible for him to perform his duties.

In the event of it not being possible for the committee chairman and his deputy to exercise their functions, the committee elects from its ranks a temporary chairman who acts in this capacity until the return of the chairman or his deputy to the performance of his duties or until the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet's election of a new committee chairman and deputy chairman.

Article 15. **Members of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

A member of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has a vote on all questions examined by the committee.

A member of the committee does not have the right to publicly express his opinion as to the conformity or nonconformity to the Uzbek SSR Constitution and laws of the Uzbek SSR of enactments and draft enactments being examined by the committee prior to the committee's adoption of a ruling on this question.

Article 16. **Preparation for examination of a question in the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The chairman of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee entrusts preparation for examination of a question at a meeting of the committee to one or several committee members and determines the timeframe for its completion, which must not exceed six months.

In the course of preparation of the question the committee members have the right:

to obtain from the state authorities and public organizations any documents and any information pertaining to this question;

to receive the explanations of officials of the appropriate state authorities and public organizations;

to enlist as consultants scholars and practical workers.

The refusal of officials of state authorities and public organizations to make available to the committee the requisite documents and other information and also their communication of knowingly false information entails liability in accordance with the law.

Article 17. **Examination of a question by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The chairman of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee raises the question at a meeting of the committee within one month following completion of its preparation for examination. The draft finding of the committee and the material pertaining thereto are distributed to the participants in the meeting not later than 15 days prior to the meeting.

The meeting is competent given the presence of no less than two-thirds of the persons elected to the committee.

Meetings of the committee are public. A closed meeting is permitted only in the event of it being necessary to preserve a state or other secret protected by law.

A representative of the body on whose initiative the given question is being examined and a representative of the body which promulgated the enactment or which submitted the draft enactment have the right to take part in the meeting of the committee.

The following may participate in a meeting of the committee:

the president of the Uzbek SSR;

the deputy chairmen of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and the chairmen of the standing commissions of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet;

the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers;

the chairman of the Uzbek SSR People's Control Committee;

the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court, the Uzbek SSR prosecutor, the chief state arbiter of the Uzbek SSR, and the Uzbek SSR minister of justice.

The person presiding or, on his behalf, a member of the committee sets forth the essence of the question at issue. The representative of the body on whose initiative the given question is being examined and of the body which promulgated the enactment or submitted the draft enactment have the right to express their opinion on the question at issue. As the committee decides, other persons may be heard at the meeting also.

For the adoption of a ruling the committee conducts a meeting attended only by the persons which are members thereof.

The committee's finding is announced in open session and is publishable.

Article 18. **Finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

A finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee contains a conclusion concerning the conformity or nonconformity of the enactment, draft enactment, or individual provisions thereof at issue to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or laws of the Uzbek SSR and, where appropriate, to international commitments of the Uzbek SSR also. Reasons for the finding must be provided.

The committee's finding is adopted by majority vote of the persons who are members of the committee. These persons do not have the right to abstain. In instances where the vote is evenly split, the chairman has the casting vote.

A member of the committee with a particular opinion may set it forth in writing. In this case it is incorporated in the committee's finding as a separate part.

Article 19. **Forwarding of findings of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet**

Findings of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee concerning draft laws of the Uzbek SSR and other enactments submitted for examination by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and laws of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and other instruments adopted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and also concerning the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution and Karakalpak ASSR laws are submitted to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

The adoption by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee of findings specified in this article does not suspend laws of the Uzbek SSR and other instruments adopted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution, or individual provisions thereof.

A finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee concerning the nonconformity to the Uzbek SSR Constitution of an instrument adopted by the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and also to the Karakalpak ASSR Constitution or individual provisions thereof may be set aside by a decision of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet adopted by two-thirds vote of the total number of Uzbek SSR people's deputies. A finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is presented for discussion and a vote during the nearest sitting in time of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 20. **Forwarding of the finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee to the body that promulgated the enactment**

A finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee is in all cases forwarded to the body that promulgated the enactment in whose connection the finding has been adopted; and the body on whose initiative the question is being examined and, simultaneously, the president of the Uzbek SSR and the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 21. **Suspension or inoperability of an enactment not conforming to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or an Uzbek SSR law**

The adoption by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee of a finding on the nonconformity of an enactment or individual provisions thereof to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or an Uzbek SSR law, other than the findings specified in Article 19 of this law, suspends the enactment in full or in an individual part thereof until the said nonconformity is eliminated.

Notice that an enactment or individual provisions thereof are not enforceable is published and disseminated in the same procedure as an enactment which is suspended was published and disseminated.

A finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee affirming that some prescriptive legal enactment or individual provisions thereof violate the basic rights and liberties of the individual enshrined in the Uzbek SSR Constitution and in international enactments to which the Uzbek SSR subscribes entails the inoperability of this enactment or individual provisions thereof from the time of adoption of the committee's finding.

Article 22. **Elimination of the nonconformity of an enactment to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or Uzbek SSR law**

The body that promulgated the enactment eliminates within two months the nonconformity of the enactment or individual provisions thereof to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or Uzbek SSR law specified in the finding of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee. If necessary, the timeframe of the elimination of the nonconformity may be extended by the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet.

Upon expiration of the said timeframe, if the nonconformity has not been eliminated, the committee makes a submission to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet or Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers accordingly concerning cancellation of the enactment of the body or official accountable thereto or individual provisions of the enactment not conforming to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or an Uzbek SSR law.

A decision of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet concerning the rejection of a finding of the committee is adopted by two-thirds vote of the total number of Uzbek SSR people's deputies. Unless a proposal concerning rejection of a committee finding obtains the necessary number of votes in the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, the enactment or individual provisions thereof not conforming to the Uzbek SSR Constitution or an Uzbek SSR law becomes inoperative.

Article 23. **Right of legislative initiative of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

In accordance with the Uzbek SSR Constitution, the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has the right of legislative initiative.

If the committee discovers that compliance with the provisions of the Uzbek SSR Constitution is being impeded by the absence of the corresponding legislative enactment and also in other instances, it makes a representation to the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet on the need for the preparation and adoption of such an enactment.

IV. STATUS OF PERSONS ELECTED TO THE UZBEK SSR CONSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Article 24. **Independence of the persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

Persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee are in the performance of their duties independent and submit only to the Uzbek SSR Constitution. They must not solicit or obtain instructions from any state authorities, public organizations, or officials.

Article 25. **Incompatibility of the status of a person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee with membership of other bodies**

A person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee may not simultaneously be a people's deputy or a member of bodies whose enactments are under the committee's supervision.

Article 26. **Right to attend meetings of state authorities**

The chairman, deputy chairman, and members of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee have the right to attend sittings of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet and the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Article 27. **Immunity of the persons elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

A person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee may n ' have criminal proceedings brought against him, be ..rrested, or be subjected to measures of administrative punishment imposed in legal form without the committee's consent. A decision on consent is adopted by secret ballot by two-thirds of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

A person elected to the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee may not have any proceedings instituted against him for the expression of his opinion or his vote during the examination of cases in the committee.

V. OTHER QUESTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITY OF THE UZBEK SSR CONSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Article 28. **Standing orders of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee adopts the committee's standing orders.

Article 29. **Publication of findings and other material of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

Findings and other material of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee are published in VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA UZBEKSKOY SSR.

Article 30. **Secretariat of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

Information-reference and other auxiliary work is performed by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee Secretariat. Regulations governing the committee secretariat and its structure and manning levels are approved by the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

Article 31. **Seal of the Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee**

The Uzbek SSR Constitutional Oversight Committee has a seal portraying the coat of arms of the Uzbek SSR and its name in Uzbek and Russian.

[Signed] I. Karimov, president of the Uzbek SSR.
[Dated] Tashkent, 20 June 1990.